THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Studies in Sacred Theology

Number 133

The Kingdom's Coming: Luke 17, 20 - 21

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Theology of the Catholic University of America
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology

By

Reverend Richard J. Sneed, O.S.B., S.T.L., S.S.L.

Washington, D.C.
1962

Imprimi potest:

Philip A. Berning, O.S.B., Abbot
St. Gregory's Abbey
Shawnee, Oklahoma
January 15, 1962

Nihil obstat:

Edward F. Siegman, C.PP.S.
Censor deputatus
January 31, 1962

Imprimatur:

+ Victor J. Reed, S.T.D.
Bishop of Oklahoma City & Tulsa
February 5, 1962

COPYRIGHTED
by
REV. RICHARD JOSEPH SNEED, O.S.B.
1963

This dissertation was approved by the Reverend Edward F. Siegman, C.PP.S., Professor of New Testament, as director and by the Reverend Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm. and the Reverend Christian P. Ceroke, O. Carm., as readers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Table of Contents		iv
List of Abbreviations		v
Chapter		
I.	An Introduction to the Problem.	1
II.	A Summary History of the Interpretation of Lk 17, 20 - 21	6
	The Patristic Period and the Middle Ages--The Age of Humanism and the Reformation Centuries--From 1890 to the Present--Conclusions.	
III.	The Meaning of μετὰ παρατηρήσεως and ἐντὸς ὑμῶν	42
	Texts and Versions--The Meaning of μετὰ παρατηρήσεως--Conclusions--The Meaning of ἐντὸς ὑμῶν --Conclusions.	
IV.	A Form-Critical Analysis of Lk 17, 20f: Preliminary Considerations	73
V.	The Origin and Meaning of Lk 17, 20f.	92
	Lk 17, 20f and The Travel Narrative--Literary Forms Immediately Surrounding Lk 17, 20f--Lk 17, 20f is a Pronouncement Story--A Pauline Parallel and Its Implications--Historical Crisis and the Pronouncement--The Function of the Narrative Introduction--Recapitulation--What is to Be Said of Lk 17, 21a?--Lk 17, 20 - 21 and 17, 22 - 37--The Sitze: Conclusions.	
Select Bibliography		138

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations of the books of the Bible are those indicated on the cover of the Catholic Biblical Quarterly. Critical editions of patristic writings are abbreviated as follows:

CC	Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Orientalium
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
GCS	Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte
PG	Migne, Patrologia Graeca

Other abbreviations:

BJRylL	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
DBS	Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplément
ExpT	Expository Times
HarvTR	Harvard Theological Review
Interpr	Interpretation
LXX	Septuagint
NT	New Testament
OT	Old Testament
RB	Revue Biblique
RSR	Recherches de Science Religieuse
TS	Theological Studies
ThWNT	Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum NT
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZTkir	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

CHAPTER I

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

In an exceptionally articulate summary of the controlling principles necessary for the valid application of the form-critical method, O. Cullmann has called attention to the fact that confronts anyone seriously intending an interpretation of the gospels, viz. that "the gospels are by nature the church's witness to its faith and not historical reports, and this fact makes extraordinarily difficult the task of using the gospels as sources for the historical Jesus."[1] At the same time Cullmann correctly insists that though the gospels are not modern biographies, "this relieves neither the historian nor the theologian of the obligation to undertake this difficult task."[2]

The present effort is not an essay in historical criticism, though it does not avoid the question of historicity. Nor is it a contribution to apologetics, though some attention is devoted to data that might be of value to that science.

---

[1] O. Cullmann, "Out of Season Remarks on the 'Historical Jesus' of the Bultmann School," tr. J. Martyn, Union Seminary Quarterly Review 16 (1961), p. 132.

[2] Ibid.

Rather, the present study has a very limited objective: an exegetical insight into one pericope, Lk 17, 20-21. And since the third gospel, like the other gospels, represents the Church's witness to its faith, the ultimate concern in this investigation is an insight into that segment of the faith which Lk 17, 20f transmits. Yet, because the historical Jesus is the source of the Church's faith and of the gospel tradition, it follows that the present analysis must also specify whatever information the examination of the pericope furnishes about his person and message.

The little pericope has more than a normal share of difficult, if not enigmatic, phrases. The text reads:

20a Ἐπερωτηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν φαρισαίων, πότε ἔρχεται
ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν·
20b οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως,
21a οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν· ἰδοὺ ὧδε ἢ ἐκεῖ·
21b ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν.

Traditionally, the protagonists in the debate on Lk 17, 20f have belonged to one of two schools of interpretation,

---

[3] A. Merk, Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine, 7th ed. (Rome, 1951), p. 269.

both of which view the crux of the discussion as the phrase ἐντὸς ὑμῶν . On the one hand, Greek scholars, familiar with the use of ἐντός and a relatively consistent tradition of exegesis, read, "The kingdom of God is within you." At once, however, they are faced with the fact that this purely immanentist conception of the kingdom as a state of mind or indwelling in the human soul is alien to the teaching of Jesus throughout the gospels. Indeed, as T. W. Manson has observed, "Elsewhere in the gospel it is the man that enters into the kingdom, and not the kingdom into the man."[4]

On the other hand, a respectable number of theologians and exegetes, seeing the difficulties of the above interpretation, have insisted on reading, "The kingdom of God is among you." This version is, in turn, capable of a variety of meanings, e.g. eschatological (with apocalyptic copula), "Lo! The kingdom is (suddenly) in your midst," or, more simply, with reference to the presence of Jesus and his works, "Behold, the kingdom of God is (already) in your midst."

Opponents of this view point out that when Lk wishes to say "among" or "in the midst of," he employs ἐν μέσῳ which occurs twelve times in his gospel and Acts,[5] whereas ἐντός is found only once more in the entire NT (Mt 23, 26). In addition,

---

[4] H. Major, T. Manson, C. Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus (London, 1940), p. 595.

[5] A. Moulton and H. Geden, A Concordance to the Greek Testament (Edinburgh, 1926), p. 630f.

it is objected that ἐντός never means simply "among" in classical Greek nor in the language of the papyri and not at all in the LXX, and that such a version ignores the Fathers and the whole exegetical tradition.[6]

Moreover, there is the question of precisely what is meant by the phrase μετὰ παρατηρήσεως (v. 20b). Does it signify apocalyptic calculation?[7] Or does it mean calendaric determination?[8]

Further, it must be said that the literary form of Lk 17, 20f has received scant attention.[9] And to neglect the form, which is surely a key to the function and content of the pericope, is to neglect one of the richest resources available for its interpretation.

---

[6] Cf. e.g. P. Allen, "The Meaning of ἐντός," ExpT 49 (1937), pp. 476 - 477; "Luke 17, 21," ExpT 50 (1938), pp. 233 - 235.

[7] Cf. e.g. W. G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfillment, tr. D. Barton (Naperville, 1957), p. 32ff.

[8] Cf. e.g. A. Strobel, "Die Passa-Erwartung als urchristliches Problem in Lc 17, 20f," ZNW 49 (1958), p. 172ff.

[9] V. Taylor (The Formation of the Gospel Tradition [London repr, 1960], p. 69) classifies Lk 17, 20f but does not discuss it, R. Bultmann (Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition [Göttingen, 1957], p. 24) devotes less than half a page to the pericope. M. Dibelius (Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, ed. G. Bornkamm [Tübingen, 1959], p. 162) simply repeats Bultmann without expanding the discussion.

The present study therefore is divided into four major sections. Chapter two surveys in more detail the problems raised by Lk 17, 20f in its historical solutions. The varieties of interpretation that the pericope has elicited not only put into better focus the difficulties that face the exegete but also contribute valuable insights into the passage.

In chapter three, after a consideration of the text and versions of Lk 17, 20f, a philological analysis of the disputed phrases is offered.

Chapter four reviews the basic assumptions of form criticism and outlines the steps to be followed in form-critical analysis.

Chapter five classifies the literary form of Lk 17, 20f and treats the individual components of the form in their order of importance. Drawing on the converging evidence throughout this work, the chapter concludes with a delineation of the Sitz im Leben Jesu, the Sitz im Leben Ecclesiae, and the Sitz im Evangelium.

CHAPTER II

A SUMMARY HISTORY OF THE INTERPRETATION OF LK 17, 20-21[1]

The following survey divides itself into three periods: the patristic period and the middle ages; the age of Humanism and the Reformation centuries, and 1890 to the present. This chapter endeavors to put into relief concurrent lines of interpretation, lines which occasionally cross and recross, thus illustrating the persistent, but always partially unsatisfactory, efforts to cope with the puzzling Lucan text.

---

[1] It is altogether possible that this summary may strike the reader as superfluous in view of the fact that much of the same material has been ably assembled by Bent Noack, "Aus der Geschichte der Auslegung," Das Gottesreich bei Lukas (Symbolae Biblicae Upsaliensis 10: Uppsala, 1948), pp. 1 - 38. The present writer readily acknowledges a partial debt to Noack's survey. At the same time a review of the history of interpretation appears to be in order for at least three reasons. First, Noack totally neglects 20th century Catholic commentators (not even Lagrange merits mention). Second, a number of recent studies have shed new light on the text or interpretation of older material (e.g. Fitzmyer's reconstruction of Oxy. P. 654 on the basis of the Nag'-Hammâdi finds). Third, and most important for justifying a re-survey, is the fact that C. H. Roberts's conclusions (see below) were available only after Noack's work was at the press; yet only Roberts's conclusions permit the historian to see clearly that there are within the patristic period not two interpretations of Lk 17, 20-21, but three.

The Patristic Period and the Middle Ages

The oldest interpretation of Lk 17, 20f is a Gnostic saying found in the second logion of Oxy. P. 654, which is dated by Grenfell and Hunt "to the middle or end of the third century."[2] However, J. A. Fitzmyer has demonstrated conclusively that the Oxyrhynchus fragments 1, 654, and 655 are in fact part of the Gospel According to Thomas.[3] And if, in the light of the Coptic version of the Gospel According to Thomas,[4] Fitzmyer is also correct in suggesting that the Gospel According to Thomas to which Hippolytus (c. 230 a.d.) refers[5] is not the Infancy Gospel of Thomas the Israelite, but one represented by the Oxyrhynchus fragments and the Coptic text, then of course the interpretation itself belongs to the beginnings of the third century or even very much earlier, e.g. sometime in the first half of the second century.

---

[2] B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, New Sayings of Jesus and a Fragment of a Lost Gospel (London, 1904), p. 9.

[3] J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Oxyrhynchus Logoi of Jesus and the Coptic Gospel According to Thomas," TS 20 (1959), pp. 505 - 560.

[4] Ibid., p. 521.

[5] Hippolytus, Elenchus 5, 7 (GCS 26:83): περὶ τὴν —— φύσιν ἥντερ φησὶ [τὴν] ἐντὸς ἀνθρώπου βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν ζητομένην, περὶ ἧς διαρρήδην ἐν τῷ κατὰ Θωμᾶν ἐπιγραφομένῳ εὐαγγελίῳ παραδιδόασι ——

Employing the Coptic version as an outside control, Fitzmyer's reconstruction of Oxy. P. 654:2, 9 - 21 reads:

λέγει Ἰ[ησοῦς ἐὰν]
οἱ ἕλκοντες ὑμᾶς [εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν· ἰδοὺ]
ἡ βασιλεία ἐν οὐρα[νῷ, ὑμᾶς φθήσεται]
τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρ[ανοῦ. ἐαν δ' εἴπωσιν ὅ-]
τι ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν ἐστ[ιν, εἰσελεύσονται]
οἱ ἰχθύες τῆς θαλάσ[σης φθάσαν-]
τες ὑμᾶς καὶ ἡ βασ[ιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ]
ἐντὸς ὑμῶν [ἐ]στι [κακτός· ὃς ἂν ἑαυτὸν]
γνῷ, ταύτην εὑρή[σει, καὶ ὅτε ὑμεῖς]
ἑαυτοὺς γνώσεσθε, [εἰδήσετε, ὅτι υἱοί]
ἐστε ὑμεῖς τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ][ῶντος· εἰ δὲ μὴ]
γνώσ⟨εσ⟩θε ἑαυτούς, [ἐν τῇ πτωχείᾳ ἐστὲ]
καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἡ πτω[χεία.][6]

Fitzmyer renders the logion:

> Je[sus] says, [If] those who draw you on
> [say to you, 'Behold] the kingdom (is) in the
> heav[en,'] the birds of the hea[ven will be
> (there) before you. But if they say th]at it
> is under the earth, the fishes of the se[a will
> enter before you]. And the king[dom of God] is

---

[6]Fitzmyer, loc. cit., p. 520.

within you [and outside (of you). Whoever]
knows [himself,] will fin[d] it [and when you]
know yourselves, [you will realize that] you
are [sons] of the li[ving] Father. [But if you
will not] know yourselves, [you are] in poverty
and you are pov[erty.] [7]

Fitzmyer comments that the οἱ ἕλκοντες are Jesus's opponents "whose teaching he is reducing to absurdity before he affirms that the kingdom is within and without." [8]

Assuredly, " . . . the exact meaning of the kingdom being 'within you and without' is puzzling." [9] However, the present writer finds Fitzmyer's reconstruction preferable to that of A. Rüstow [10] because it is controlled by an outside

---

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid. The reductio ad absurdum as well as the positive affirmation certainly seems to have been cast in the light of Dt 30, 12-14 (and Rm 10, 6-8?) which the patristic era frequently recalls for light on Lk 17, 20f.

[9] Ibid., p. 520.

[10] A. Rüstow ("ΕΝΤΟΣ ΥΜΩΝ ΕΣΤΙΝ : zur Deutung von Lukas 17, 20-21," ZNW 51 [1960], pp. 221 - 223) accepts Fitzmyer's reconstruction except for lines 15, 16 which he reads:

15. τες ὑμᾶς· ἀλλὰ ἡ βασ[ιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ]
16 ἐντὸς ὑμῶν [ἐ]στι [καὶ μὴ ἐκτός· ὃς ἐ' ἂν ἑαυτὸν]

Rüstow's hypothetical restoration of the negative μή in line 16 (thus: the kingdom is within you and not outside) gives unequivocal clarity to the entire passage. But his assumption that the negative simply dropped out (and for this reason does not appear in the Coptic recension) is too tenuous. Since line 15 of the Coptic text begins with an adversative and since Gnostic principles would have favored the negative that Rüstow restores, it is very difficult to assign any cogent

guide, the Coptic Gospel According to Thomas, which certainly reads "the kingdom is within you and outside of you."[11]

Whatever "within you and outside of you" means (e.g. inside of you and outside of you inside others so privileged?), the value of this Gnostic use of Lk lies in the witness it gives to a very early understanding of the pericope. This

---

reason for the Coptic redactor's having omitted the negative when its inclusion clearly would have better suited his purposes. And even if the negative were presupposed but unexpressed in the text placed before the Coptic redactor, why would he have failed to express it in Coptic, rather than offer a version that is all but unintelligible? Sound principles of textual criticism would not seem to favor the abandonment of a controlled reconstructio difficilior if the alternative is the type of uncontrolled reconstruction that preceded the discovery of the Nag'-Hammâdi material.

Rüstow also suggests the possibility that the development of Lk 17, 21 in Oxy. P. 654,2 is the source of the "immanent" interpretation of the verse. In other words, he suggests that such an interpretation, which finds classic phrasing in Luther's version (ἐντὸς ὑμῶν = "inwendig in euch"), derives from a Gnostic setting: "Der Ursprung der spiritualistischen Deutung wäre dann also eine gnostische Umdeutung." (loc. cit., p. 222). This view strikes the present writer as a misleading oversimplification. Rightly or wrongly, the patristic period offers many examples of an interpretation not unlike that of Luther. But it is not necessary to appeal to Gnostic influence when Lk's own use of the phrase ἔντος ὑμῶν lends itself to a philologically acceptable rendering of "inwendig in euch." To anticipate a bit: the history of interpretation demonstrates that the origin of the interior, spiritual notion of the kingdom must be laid to Lk's own ambiguous phraseology, a phraseology that easily adapts itself to any occasion (e.g. homiletic) or movement (e.g. Gnosticism) that happens to demand an immanent concept of the kingdom.

[11] Fitzmyer, loc. cit., p. 519.

understanding is at least partially in terms of an interior spiritual quality to be found upon the condition of self-knowledge which, judging especially from the Coptic version, enables the one so privileged to be known and to know others as "sons of the living Father."[12]

The period from Hippolytus to Venerable Bede, as also the succeeding ages, takes 17, 21b as the point of departure and emphasis. It is possible, however, to discern more than one current of interpretation concerning the meaning of ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν. Some Fathers see a hidden entity. Thus Hippolytus:[13]

---

[12]Herewith, for the convenience of the reader, Fitzmyer's rendering of the Coptic:

> Jesus said, "If those who draw you on say to you, 'Behold, the kingdom is in the heaven,' then the birds of the heaven shall be (there) before you. If they say to you, 'It is in the sea (thalassa),' then the fishes will be (there) before you. But (alla) the kingdom is within you and outside of you. When (hotan) you know yourselves, then (tote) they will know you (or: you will be known) and you will realize that you are the sons of the living Father. But if you do not know yourselves, then you are in poverty and you are poverty. (80, 19-27; 81, 1-4)

[13]It must be said, however, that the context does not clearly indicate that this is Hippolytus's interpretation. He is refuting the heresies of the Naassenes (a sect with which he associates the Gospel According to Thomas) who employ this interpretation as one of many supports for their teaching. On the other hand, Hippolytus does not imply that the interpretation itself is false; he simply lists it as a part of Naassene apologetic.

— ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐντὸς ὑμῶν κατακειμένη ὡς θησαυρός, ὡς ζύμη εἰς ἀλεύρου τρία σάτα κεκρυμμένη.[14]

Origen (c. 235 a.d.) is not entirely consistent. In a homily he writes:

> . . . non omnibus Salvator dixit: regnum Dei intra vos est; siquidem in peccatoribus regnum peccati est et absque ulla ambiguitate aut regnum Dei in corde nostro imperat aut peccati.[15]

In the same vein, this time in a chapter treating of the Holy Spirit, he says:

> . . . 'regnum Dei intra vos est.' Sed et illud videndum est, ne forte eadem significet quod in Genesi scriptum est cum ait: 'Et insufflavit in faciem eius spiramentum vitae, et factus est homo in animam vivam . . .
>
> Quod si generaliter in omnes homines datum esse intelligitur, omnes homines habent participium Dei; si vero hoc de spiritu Dei dictum intelligendum est, quoniam et Adam prophetasse de nonnullis invenitur, ergo jam non generaliter sed sanctis quibusque datum accipi potest.[16]

That in the above passages Origen is speaking of a life-principle is evident. However, he employs Lk 17, 21b in yet another sense. In his homily In Numeros Origen writes:

---

[14]Hippolytus, Elenchus 5, 8.8 (GCS 6:90).

[15]Origen, Hom. 36 (GCS 49:207).

[16]Idem., De Principiis I 3,6 (GCS 32:57 - 58).

> . . . intra nos est salutis occasio, sicut et Dominus dixit: 'Ecce enim regnum Dei intra vos est.' Intra nos namque est conversionis facultas.[17]

This understanding of the text represents another current of interpretation that will receive attention shortly. For the present, continuing the line of thought that emphasizes the immanent, attention may be turned to Athanasius, who practically identifies the kingdom ἐντὸς ὑμῶν with faith; he attributes to Moses the thought of Rm 10, 6-8, which is, of course, a use of Dt 30, 12-14:

— ἀλλ' ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστι καὶ ἀφ' ἡμῶν εὑρεῖν τὴν ἀρχὴν δυνατόν, καθὼς καὶ Μωυσῆς ἐδίδασκε λέγων· Τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως ἐντὸς τῆς καρδίας σού ἐστιν. ὅπερ καὶ ὁ σωτὴρ σημαίνων καὶ βεβαιῶν ἔλεγεν· ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν.[18]

So also Gregory of Nyssa in De Virginibus, where he makes ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ synonymous with τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγαθόν and hence, with Athanasius, is thinking of an inner quality.[19]

---

[17] Origen, Hom. 24 (GCS 30:228).

[18] Athanasius, Contra Gentes 30 (PG 25:60).

[19] Gregory of Nyssa, De Virginibus 12 (PG 26:871).

Ambrose continues the same tradition:

> Regnum Dei intra vos est; utique per veritatem gratiae, non per servitutem culpae. Itaque qui vult esse liber, sit servus in Domino: ea enim parte qua participamur servitute, participamur et regno.[20]

Jerome's letters reveal the same use of the text that appears in Ambrose. Aiming at dissuading a certain Paulinus from coming to the Holy Land, Jerome writes:

> . . . qui dicunt: templum domini, templum domini, templum domini, audiant ab apostolo: vos estis templum Dei et Spiritus Sanctus habitat in vobis. Et de Hierosolymis et de Brittania aequaliter patet aula caelestis; regnum Dei intra nos est.[21]

Venerable Bede (d. 735 a.d.) simply repeats what has become by his day a venerable use of the text:

> Regnum Dei seipsum dicit, intra illos utique positum, hoc est in cordibus eorum, ubi credidere regnantem. Unde scriptum est, 'Prope est verbum in ore tuo et in corde tuo, hoc est, autem verbum fidei quod praedicamus.'[22]

---

[20]Ambrose, Comm. in. Lc. 8, 5.33 (CSEL 32:406).

[21]Jerome, Ep. 58,3 "Ad Paulin. Presby." (CSEL 54:531). Cf. also an identical use of the text in a letter attempting to persuade Marcella to come to the Holy Land (Ep. 46, 10 "Paulae et Eustochiae ad Marcellam," CSEL 54:339). The same use of the text is found in a letter of condolence (Ep. 60,3 "Ad Heliodorum Epitaphium Nepotiani," CSEL 54:552), ". . . qui in carne non secundum carnem vivimus, muncipatum habeamus in caelo et hic adhuc positis dicatur in terra: regnum Dei intra vos est."

[22]Bede, In Lucae evang. 5 (CC 120:315).

A different strand of interpretation from the patristic period is rather more moralistic, though nonetheless occupied with man's interior. So Tertullian:

> Quis non interpretabitur, intra vos est, id est in potestate vestra, si audiatis, si faciatis Dei praeceptum? Quod si in praecepto est Dei regnum, propone igitur contra, secundum nostras antitheses, Moysen, et una sententia est. 'Praeceptum,' inquit, 'excelsum non est etc. --- in corde tuo, et in manibus tuis facere illud (Dt 30, 11 - 14). Hoc erit, 'Non hic nec illic, ecce enim intra vos est regnum Dei.[23]

Tertullian's use of Lk 17, 21b recalls the "occasio salutis . . . conversionis facultas" of Origen. Tertullian, however, explicitly relates the text to Dt 30, 11 - 14, as did the author of the Gospel According to Thomas, though not with the same results.

Similarly, Cyprian employs Lk 17, 21b to show that within man lies a responsibility for faith or unbelief:

> In Deuteronomio: Ecce dedi ante faciem tuam vitam et mortem, bonum et malum. Elige vitam ut vivas. Item apud Esaiam: Et si volueritis et audieritis me, bona terrae edetis: si autem nolueritis et non audieritis me, gladius vos comedet. Os enim Domini locutum est ista. Item in evangelio secundum Lucam: Regnum Dei intra vos est.[24]

---

[23] Tertullian, Adv. Marcion 4, 35 (CSEL 47:542).

[24] Cyprian, Testim. 3, 52 (CSEL 3:155).

Cyril of Alexandria also reflects the interpretation seen already in the writings of Tertullian, Origen, and Cyprian, but Cyril is more precise. It is he, for example, who notes that the question of the Pharisees concerns the time of the coming kingdom, while Jesus's reply is in terms of the kind and manner. In the first part of his commentary on Lk 17, 20f it appears as if Cyril will only repeat the notion that the kingdom is within the power of each man:

οὐκοῦν ἐντόμως μὲν οὐκ ἐλέγχει, πονηροὺς δὲ ὄντας, ἀποκρίσεως τοῖς ἐπερωτῆσιν οἰκείας οὐκ ἀξιοῖ· πλὴν ἐκεῖνο μόνον φησὶν εἰς ὄνησιν ἀνθρώπου παντός· Ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν· οὐκ ἔρχεται μετὰ παρατηρήσεως, μὴ γὰρ δὴ χρόνους ἐρωτᾶτε, φησί, καθ' οὓς ἐπιλάμψει πάλιν, ἤγουν ὁ καιρὸς ἐνστήσεται τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας, σπουδάσατε δὲ μᾶλλον τυχεῖν αὐτῆς, ἐντὸς γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστι· τουτέστιν ἐν ταῖς ὑμετέραις προαιρέσεσι καὶ ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ κεῖται τὸ λαβεῖν αὐτήν· ἔξεστι γὰρ ἀνθρώπῳ παντὶ τὴν εἰς τὸν χριστὸν δικαίωσιν τὴν διὰ πίστεως, δηλονότι καταπλουτήσαντι, καὶ διὰ πάσης ἀρετῆς ἐκλελαμπρυσμένῳ, τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας τυχεῖν. Ἐνεργείᾳ μὲν γὰρ ἐκτός ἐστιν, ἀφ' ὧν ἐξίασιν ἐκ τῆς καρδίας διαλογισμοὶ πονηροί· δυνάμει δὲ ἐντὸς πάντων.[25]

---

[25] Cyril of Alexandria, Explanatio in Lc. 368 (PG 72: 840 - 841).

To sum up the investigation to this point: one may distinguish in the treatment of Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, and Cyril of Alexandria an understanding of Lk 17, 21b that definitely does differ from that of many of their contemporaries. The latter employ the passage in contexts dealing with an inner quality or state of man (Oxy. P. 654:2; Hippolytus, Origen, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, Jerome, etc.); the former look to the text as support for the idea that man has the internal ability to accept whatever the kingdom implies. As chapter three of the present study shows, this second strand of interpretation is also philologically defensible, though the fact was not clearly recognized until 1948.[26]

There is still a third use of the text within the patristic era. Continuing the commentary on Lk 17, 20f, Cyril of Alexandria exemplifies a use of the text that many modern commentators accept. Cyril considers the fact that v. 21b is, after all, a reply to the Pharisees. He then answers the question of how Jesus can assert that the kingdom of God is ἐντὸς τῶν φαρισαίων:

---

[26] Cf. C. H. Roberts ("The Kingdom of Heaven Lk XVII.21," HarvTR 41 [1948], pp. 1 - 8) to whom belongs the credit for putting this interpretation on a reasonably sound philological basis (cf. chapter three of the present study). Roberts's conclusions were not published in time for Noack to draw the further conclusion that ἐντὸς ὑμῶν rendered as "within your power" is more than an accommodation of the text.

Ὅτι γὰρ καὶ τῶν Φαρισαίων ἐντὸς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀγνοούντων καὶ οἰομένων χρόνῳ τινὶ αὐτὴν εἰς τόπον ἔξωθεν ἔρχεσθαι, Ἰωάννης δείκνυσι λέγων· Μέσος δὲ ὑμῶν ἕστηκεν ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε· περὶ Χριστοῦ λέγων.[27]

Cyril has seen a valid objection to his earlier comments and has resorted to a double treatment of the passage: (1) Even the Pharisees have the occasion of salvation in themselves, (2) for Christ is among them. Hence Cyril may be considered one of the earliest of a long line of commentators who in fact make ἐντός and ἐν μέσῳ synonymous. It is not claimed, of course, that Cyril even implies philological support for his double treatment; it is not even suggested that he was conscious of the fact that his own exegesis

---

[27] Cyril of Alexandria, Explanatio in Lc. 368 (PG 72: 841). Rüstow's assessment (loc. cit., p. 220) of this section of Cyril's commentary is curious: "Er selbst Cyril zieht daraus zwar noch keineswegs etwa die Folgerung der Interpretation B ["inter vos"]. Aber es wäre möglich, dass anderswo diese Zusammenstellung bei der Entstehung jener Interpretation Pate gestanden hätte." As remarked above, Cyril draws no philological conclusions; such a methodology belongs to succeeding centuries. It is equally clear, however, that for the purposes of answering an objection, he equates ἐντὸς ὑμῶν with ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν. The result in Cyril's exegesis is inconsistent, but hardly anachronistic in an age when exegetical Folgerungen were independent of rigorous philological investigation. We have in Cyril, not the godfather of the interpretation "inter vos" but a direct ancestor of its philological defense.

was inconsistent. It cannot be insisted upon too much that philological arguments and rigid consistency in applying them were utterly beyond the scope of interpretation in the patristic era.

Prior to Cyril a similar double use of Lk 17, 21 occurs in Ephrem Syrus, who writes (c. 363 a.d.):

> Ubi rex est, ibi est regnum. Ideo dixit: Regnum Dei intus in corde vestro est. Non, ait, est regnum Dei diebus discernendum, quia observabant isti tempora et aetates (ut scirent) num ecce in eis oriturus esset (Christus) . . . Ecce (aderat) Dominus gregis, quando intrabat in ovile suum per januam, id est in hereditatem suam confidenter, per signa et miracula fortiter (et) ecce intus in corde vestro est per testimonia sua, non occulte, ita ut opus habeant quaerentes ipsum observationibus discernentibus.[28]

In the passage just cited Ephrem identifies the regnum intus in corde with the witness afforded Christ by his works. In the same chapter, however, the Syrian deacon continues:

> Vae vobis, ait (Dominus), legisperitis, quia absconditis vos claves (11, 52) id est quia occultaverant cognitionem manifestationis Domini nostri quae in prophetis erat. Si enim ipse Dominus noster porta est, ut et dixit, patet etiam claves cognitionis eius esse. Per hanc portam vitae noluerunt intrare scribae et pharisaei, ut illud quod dicit: Ecce regnum intus in corde vestro est, id est (hoc dixit) de seipso, quia in medio eorum stabat . . .[29]

---

[28] Ephrem, "Explanatio evangelii concordantis quae facta est a Mar Ephrem Doctore Syro," tr. L. Leloir (CSCO 145: 183 - 185).

[29] Ibid.

Obviously, "intus in corde vestro" can hardly mean "among" or "in the midst of," but Ephrem does not hesitate to add "id est . . . de seipso . . . in medio eorum." The interpretation is as clear as it is inconsistent. The methodology belongs to a former age, and it is almost inconceivable to the modern mind. The conclusion, however, is not inconceivable.

A like treatment of Ik 17, 21b extends into the middle ages where it is found, for example, in the Scholia Vetera[30] and Theophylact.[31]

By the time of Euthymios Zigabenos (c. 1200 a.d.), the evolution is complete: on the basis of Lk 10, 9.11: ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, the kingdom is made explicitly synonymous with Christ, and ἐντὸς ὑμῶν means ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν:

— βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἑαυτὸν λέγει, ὡς βασιλεία καὶ θεόν. Ἐντὸς δὲ αὐτῶν ἦν, ὡς ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν ἀναστρεφόμενος, περὶ οὗ καὶ ὁ πρόδρομος εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι μέσος ὑμῶν ἔστηκεν ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε —[32]

---

[30] PG 106:1208.

[31] Theophylact, "Ennarratio in ev. Lc." (PG 123:992-993).

[32] Euthymios Zigabenos, "Ennarratio in Ev. Lc" (PG 129: 1048). Christ is identified with the kingdom as far back as

Even though necessarily brief and cross-sectional, the foregoing survey makes it abundantly clear that a unanimous consensus on the meaning of Lk 17, 21b is not to be found in the patristic era or the middle ages. On the contrary, three different interpretations emerge: the kingdom is "within you," or "within your power," or "among you." Proofs or parallels are rarely offered; philological support is beyond the methodology of the times. Moreover, the question of the precise nature of the kingdom is not a burning issue. So far as the use of Lk 17, 21b is concerned, the kingdom means something related to the heart or soul and variously identified with Christ himself or his rule in men by faith or grace.

As a matter of fact, the picture that emerges is exactly what is to be expected from those ages in which the aims of interpretation were, in the main, homiletic, apologetical, or edifying in nature, rather than strictly exegetical.

The Age of Humanism and the Reformation Centuries

Represented by Erasmus, the age of humanism reveals no further progress:

Origen (cf. his notion of the αὐτοβασιλεία), but not in the context of Lk 17, 20f. A marginal gloss on Zigabenos's text sheds some light on the difficulty with which the transition in interpretation was made:

— Ἡ ἐπιτυχία τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν κεῖται, ἐν τῇ προαιρέσει ὑμῶν —

> Quur expectatis foris, quod habetis intus, ac vobiscum circumfertis, si vultis? . . . ubicunque est animus superior . . . fide robustus, charitate flagrans . . . ibi est regnum Dei.[33]

The Protestant reformers of the sixteenth century, with their affirmation of the invisible Church, found polemic value in our text. M. Luther's translation is classic, "das Reich Gottes ist inwendig in euch."[34] J. Calvin, drawing on Rm 14, 17, opted for the same interior character of the kingdom in Lk 17, 21b, " . . . regnum Dei est justitia, pax, et gaudium in Spiritu Sancto."[35]

Maldonatus, like Ephrem Syrus, translates "within" and exegetes "among": " . . . poterant, si vellent, Christum recipere."[36] Cornelius a Lapide, like Tertullian, understands "intra vos est" to mean "in vestra potestate est," but adds "quia Christus, Deus, rex, hoc regnum praedicans et largiens, inter vos versatur."[37]

Seventeenth century commentators like Hugo Grotius and Calovius clearly understand "in your midst" in the sense that

---

[33]Erasmus, Paraphrases (Basel, 1522), n. 180.

[34]Luther, Die Bibel (Dresden, 1895), p. 195.

[35]Calvin, Institutiones II, 15.4 (Corpus Reform. 30:364).

[36]Maldonatus, Comm. in Lc. (Mussiponti, 1596), p. 230.

[37]Cornelius a Lapide, In Lucam (Paris, 1877), p. 234.

it is among the Jewish people that the kingdom begins to exercise its power.[38]

The eighteenth century saw the publication of two monographs dealing with Lk 17, 20f: Hannecken, Disputatio de regno Dei in nobis, Wittenburg, 1705; and J. A. Gnilius, Tentamen exegeseos ad dictum Salvatoris Luc. XVII 20 - 21 de Regno Dei in terris instituto.[39] With the exception of Hannecken, writers from this century understood ἐντός as "inter" and the kingdom was identified with the person of the Messiah. The shift in consensus was occasioned by the arguments that Jesus's response was to the Pharisees and that he wished to show the kingdom of God through preaching and miracles.

The bulk of the nineteenth century offered little that was new. W. de Wette[40] and F. Godet[41] saw in Lk 17, 21 a rejection of the Jewish theocratic concept of the kingdom and an affirmation of the spirituality of the kingdom.

---

[38]Calovius, Biblia illustrata I (Basel, 1676), 627, 628.

[39]Neither monograph is available, so far as the present writer can ascertain. Both are cited by Noack (op. cit., p. 24), who was also unable to see them.

[40]W. M. L. de Wette, Lehrbuch der Chr. Dogmatik I (Berlin, 1818), 272ff.

[41]F. Godet, A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke, tr. E. W. Shalders and M. D. Cusin (New York, 1887), 403f.

From 1890 to the Present

After 1890 the influence of "eschatologism" becomes pronounced.[42] For the purposes of the present study it is sufficient to note that, generally speaking, Lk 17, 20f is treated within the framework of late nineteenth and twentieth century eschatological elaborations, all of which claim derivation from the same NT sources; but which differ widely and, indeed, frequently exclude one another. Further, in the light of source-critical and form-critical methods, the background of interpretation is still more complicated by recent concentration on individual NT authors' eschatological or other special theological interests which were at least partially conditioned by the historical situation within the primitive church.[43]

---

[42] W. G. Kümmel (Das Neue Testament: Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme [Freiburg, 1958]) offers one of the more recent able accounts of the historical rise, development, and content of schools of NT eschatological theory. Cf. esp. pp. 261ff.

[43] The mass of current literature so directed is enormous, and even a superficial survey is impossible here. Typical recent examples may be found in A. Strobel, "Die Passa-Erwartung als urchristliches Problem in Lc 17, 20f," ZNW 49 (1958), 157 - 196; "In dieser Nacht (Luk 17, 34)," ZTKir (1961), 16 - 29; D. M. Stanley, "Our Gospels as Salvation - History," TS 20 (1959), 561 - 589; H. Conzelmann, Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas, 3rd ed. (Tübingen, 1960); A. Feuillet, "Les Origines et la Signification de Mt 10, 23b: contribution a l'étude du problème eschatologique," CBQ 23 (1961), 182 - 198; E. F. Siegman, "Teaching in Parables," ibid., pp. 161 - 181.

Hence rather than risk the always complex and sometimes hazardous[44] task of fitting each interpretation into the "school" of thought from which it springs, the following portion of the historical survey looks primarily to the actual interpretations of Lk 17, 20f. This method of classification has value so long as it is acknowledged that though the same verbal understanding of the pericope may be found in several authors, diametrically opposed exegetical, philosophical, and theological tenets regarding the character and message of Jesus as well as Lk's presentation of them may underlie the identical conclusion. In other words, classification by verbally identical interpretations is a matter of convenience;

---

[44] W. G. Kümmel (Promise and Fulfillment, 3rd ed. tr. D. Barton [Naperville, 1957], p. 15 n.1), for example, notes that W. Schweitzer (Eschatologie und Ethik [Geneva, 1951], p. 27) has incorrectly placed C. J. Cadoux among the "konsequent" eschatologists. Moreover, Kümmel's own grouping of A. Feuillet with C. H. Dodd and other scholars who "eliminate the 'futurist' eschatology more or less completely from Jesus's preaching . . . " (Kümmel, Promise, p. 15) may be seriously questioned.

[45] There is, of course, the well known school of "konsequent" eschatology, usually associated with the names of A. Loisy and A. Schweitzer, according to which Jesus spoke only of a future reign. By way of absolute contrast is the position of "realized" eschatology, especially linked to the name of C. H. Dodd, according to which Jesus would have spoken solely of a present reign. Between these polarities of thought there is a wide range of opinion: the kingdom is present and future (e.g. M. J. Lagrange, J. Bonsirven); time in Jesus's thought is not significant (e.g. H. B. Sharman); the decisiveness of the "Christ-event" does not totally eliminate the significance of time, but it does posit a certainty that rules out the urgency connected with the Parousia (Cullmann, Jeremias).

in no way does it necessarily imply any further similarity of thought. Indeed, important differences are frequently cited in the footnotes of this section.

Allowing for the few exceptions to be noted, it may be asserted that during the past seventy years Lk 17, 21b has remained the crux interpretum and the actual point of departure for any exegesis of the pericope. The position of R. Bultmann and V. Taylor that Lk 17, 20 - 21 is in fact a pronouncement-story has served to sharpen the focus on v. 21b which is, after all, the positive part of the saying.[46]

In addition it is relatively clear that in spite of the persistent exegetical orientation to v. 21b and the new resources afforded by philological investigation, the understanding of ἐντὸς ὑμῶν is still limited, ultimately, to one of the three "uses" within the patristic period: "within you," "within your power," or "in your midst." To the problem of "how" or "when" this is so, modern exegetes propose a variety of solutions.

Many exegetes state that the pericope is a rejection of apocalyptic calculation. This group, translating ἐντὸς ὑμῶν as "in your midst," views the saying as entirely futuristic

---

[46]"Pronouncement-story" is, of course, Taylor's terminology. Cf. V. Taylor, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition (London, 1960), p. 69; R. Bultmann, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (Göttingen, 1957), p. 24.

and understands it to mean: the kingdom of God does not come in such a way that one can reckon it in advance or search for it, "for the kingdom of God will (suddenly) be in your midst." The apocalyptic copula finds support in the works of W. Wrede,[47] A. Loisy,[48] R. Bultmann,[49] E. Klostermann,[50] A. Feuillet,[51]

---

[47] W. Wrede, Vorträge und Studien (Göttingen, 1907), p. 111.

[48] A. Loisy, L' Évangile selon Luc (Paris, 1924), p. 404.

[49] R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament I, tr. K. Grobel (London, 1956), p. 6. Behind Bultmann's version lies the reasoning of the 'konsequent' eschatologist: " . . . in view of the fact that the proclamation of the irruption of God's reign was not fulfilled---that is, that Jesus' expectation of the near end of the world turned out to be an illusion---the question arises whether his idea of God was not also illusory. This question is frequently avoided . . . by the escape-reasoning that Jesus saw the presence of God's reign in his own person and in the followers who gathered about him. But such a view cannot be substantiated by a single saying of Jesus, and it contradicts the meaning of 'God's Reign.' On the contrary, Jesus clearly expected the irruption of God's reign as a miraculous world-transforming event---as Judaism, and later also his own Church, did." (p. 22) Bultmann's position recalls the famous dictum of Loisy (L' Évangile et l'Église [Bellevue, 1904], p. 155): "Jésus annoncait le Royaume, et c'est l'Église qui est venue."

[50] E. Klostermann, Das Lukasevangelium (Tübingen, 1929), pp. 175ff.

[51] A. Feuillet, "La venue du Règne de Dieu et du Fils de l'Homme (d'apres Luc XVII 20 à XVIII 8)," RSR 35 (1948), pp. 544 - 565. Feuillet here holds the apocalyptic copula as "plus probable" because of the tenor of the text and the immediately juxtaposed apocalyptic discourse (17, 22 - 37). His general thesis is that 17, 20 - 18, 8 constitutes a three-part unity dealing with the destruction of Jerusalem which is at once a punishment for the rejection of the Messiah and the definitive deliverance of the disciples for the extraordinary

J. Schmid,[52] J. Bonsirven,[53] T. W. Manson,[54]

---

expansion of the reign of God, the salutary counterpart of the catastrophe. However, Feuillet does not rule out the possibility of reading "the kingdom of God is among you." Indeed, in his "Le Règne de Dieu et la personne de Jésus d'apres les Évangiles synoptiques," Introduction à la Bible II (Tournai, 1959), p. 778, Feuillet favors a present meaning: "Si la pleine realisation est encore du domaine de l'avenir et si, à cet égard, l'ancien éon est toujours en vigueur, il n'en reste pas moins vrai que lè Regne s'est introduit sans bruit 'au milieu des Juifs' (. . . interpretation la plus probable de ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν), et c'est pourquoi les auditeurs de Jésus sont sommés de prendre parti pour ou contre le Règne: cf. Mc 12, 34; Lc 9, 61 - 62 (suivre Jésus = être propre au Règne de Dieu)."

[52] J. Schmid, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, 3rd ed. (Regensburg, 1955), p. 273.

[53] J. Bonsirven, Les Enseignments de Jésus Christ (Paris, 1946), p. 301. Like Feuillet, Bonsirven does not insist upon this interpretation. In Le Règne de Dieu (Paris, 1957) he writes: "On pourrait entendre: au moment où vous m'interrogez, le Règne de Dieu est déjà realisé, existant parmi vous, par la presence de celui qui l'a inauguré et qui le prêche. Si cette interprétation est admise, Jésus rappellerait pareillement qu'il faut faire attention à l' événement actuel, la réalisation présente du Règne de Dieu, avant de songer à un avenir éloigné." (p. 55) Bonsirven distinguishes between the reign inaugurated by the Messiah's coming, the reign developed on earth after the resurrection, and the eschatological reign properly speaking. Lk 17, 21b can be applied to any of these categories.

[54] T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London, 1954), p. 304. This interpretation, affirms Manson, "can be maintained without in any way minimizing the importance of those other passages in which the kingdom appears as a present reality working inevitably towards a future consummation . . . This interpretation of 17, 21b . . . deals with the question asked; and the reply of Jesus agrees with His genuine teaching about the final consummation as given . . . in Lk 17, 23 - 30." (pp. 304 - 405).

J. Héring,[55] and R. H. Fuller.[56]

A larger number of commentators translate, "the kingdom of God is in your midst," understanding thereby a real present. The kingdom, however, comes to mean "signs" of the kingdom[57] or the Reign effective in advance in the person or message or deeds of Jesus.[58] Thus, mutatis mutandis:

---

[55] J. Héring, Le Royaume de Dieu et sa venue (Neuchâtel, 1959), p. 42: ". . . on ne dira pas non plus: il est ci ou là; car on dira: le Royaume de Dieu est au milieu de vous."

[56] R. H. Fuller, Luke's Witness to Jesus Christ (London, 1959), pp. 54f. Fuller attributes the apocalyptic present to Christ, but holds that Lk, in the light of Jesus's death and resurrection, applies the saying to the presence of the indwelling Spirit which was the result of Christ's death and resurrection. The idea "of a future consummation is not lost sight of, as vv. 23 - 37 show." (p. 55) By way of contrast with this opinion, cf. Fuller's earlier view in The Mission and Achievement of Jesus (Chicago, 1954), p. 28f.

[57] M. Dibelius (Evangelium und Welt [Tübingen, 1929], p. 38) completes the beginnings made by J. Weiss (Die Predigt vom Reiche Gottes, 2nd ed. [Göttingen, 1900]) and A. Jülicher (Die Gleichnisreden Jesu [Tübingen, 1910]): Lk 17, 20f is primarily concerned with the question of signs. There is no need to ask about the time of the coming of the kingdom, for it will come like lightning (17, 22ff). Thus, take warning! The present is not the kingdom, but the true signs (miracles, etc.) are here. Cf. also Dibelius's Jesus (Tübingen, 1939), pp. 63ff. So, too, C. W. F. Smith, The Jesus of the Parables (London, 1948), p. 242. Since he prefers to speak of the signs of the kingdom, Smith translates, "for lo, God's reign is to be felt in your midst."

[58] X. Léon-Dufour, "Les Évangiles Synoptiques," Introduction à la Bible II (Tournai, 1959), pp. 242, 243 is perhaps typical in this group: "La bonne nouvelle, c'est le

M. J. Lagrange,[59] H. D. Wendland,[60] A. Schlatter,[61]
R. Otto,[62] C. J. Cadoux,[63] P. M. Bretscher,[64]

Royaume de Dieu, au sens qu'a pris l'objet de la prédication chrétienne. Par ce terme, Lc ne désigne pas ordinairement la realité divine a l'oeuvre sur terre (sens habituel chez Mt), mais le royaume eschatologique, or ciel, qui commande notre comportement ici-bas et exige notre foi... Si le royaume est présent sur terre (17, 21), c'est en la personne du Fils de l'homme (17, 22); ainsi s'expliquerait que même si le regne doit encore venir (11, 2) il soit cependant déjà survenu (10, 9.11; 11, 20)."

[59] M. J. Lagrange, L'Évangile selon S. Luc (Paris, 1921), pp. 459ff. Lagrange distinguishes sharply between vv. 20 - 21, whose object is the βασιλεία , and vv. 22 - 37, whose object is the coming of the Son of Man. Then, "La βασιλεία qui vient est évidemment le règne, la domination, et non le royaume." (p. 459) The reign has commenced (11, 20) and the very message of the pericope is that this reign exists before the coming of the Son of Man.

[60] H. D. Wendland, Die Eschatologie des Reiches Gottes bei Jesus (Gutersloh, 1931), pp. 46, 47.

[61] A. Schlatter, Das Evangelium des Lukas (Stuttgart, 1931), p. 204.

[62] R. Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, tr. F. Filson and B. Lee-Woolf (London, 1951), p. 135ff. The phrase ἐντὸς ὑμῶν is equivalent to ἐφ' ὑμᾶς (11, 20). The kingdom is already moving and so already present in so far as it works secretly in advance. Jesus knew of a future kingdom, that it would come, that God kept the moment in reserve and that one had to hold oneself ready.

[63] C. J. Cadoux, The Historic Mission of Jesus (London, 1941), p. 202f.

[64] P. M. Bretscher, "Luke 17, 21," Concordia Theological Monthly 15 (1944), 730ff.

B. Noack,[65] K. Rengstorff,[66] E. Stauffer,[67] W. G. Kümmel,[68]

---

[65] B. Noack, Das Gottesreich bei Lukas (Uppsala, 1948), p. 49. According to Noack, it is important to see that the happy present (v. 21b) is immediately contrasted with the sad and perilous future (vv. 22ff): " . . . das Reich Gottes ist da, solange Jesus auf Erden weilt." (p. 49).

[66] K. Rengstorff, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Göttingen, 1952), p. 202.

[67] E. Stauffer, New Testament Theology, tr. J. Marsh (London, 1955), p. 123 and note 394.

[68] W. G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfillment, tr. D. Barton (London, 1957), pp. 35ff. According to Kümmel, " . . . since Jesus . . . does not recognize any present development of the kingdom of God, there remains only the interpretation that the kingdom of God has already become effective in advance in Jesus and in the present events appearing in connection with his person. This interpretation of the difficult text stands naturally only as a hypothesis; but if it is correct, we see here for the first time in statements about the 'coming' of the Kingdom of God an eschatological statement of Jesus which speaks not of the future but of the present." Cf. also pp. 105ff.

69 70
H. Conzelmann, R. Schnackenburg,

---

69 H. Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, tr. G. Buswell (New York, 1960), pp. 120 - 125. "The problem of the exegesis of Lk 17, 20ff has been clearly stated by J. Weiss: is the kingdom a present or a future reality?" (p. 122) " . . . One may suppose that Lk has in mind Christian circles which are drawing conclusions concerning the End from the fate of the city." (p. 121 n.3) " . . . three things . . . are excluded: apocalyptic calculations in general; the connection with the fate of Jerusalem, and calculations based on the Resurrection of Jesus . . . Lk means by the kingdom a future entity . . . It is the message [italic the present writer's] of the kingdom that is present . . . He [Lk] knows nothing of an immanent development on the basis of the preaching of the kingdom . . . The main declaration is not that the kingdom is coming, but that the kingdom is being preached by Jesus and made manifest in his ministry. The 'coming' itself belongs to the future . . . " (p. 122).

" . . . Lk's struggle is essentially an anti-apocalyptic one . . ." (p. 123).

"Here we see what is for Luke the typical parallel between sayings about the nature of the Kingdom, which have no reference to time, and sayings about temporal events. He has reached the goal of his apologetic: the kingdom has appeared in Christ, although its presence is not now immanent.

"But the Church possesses a picture that can never be lost, because it possesses the account of Jesus. By virtue of this it can endure in the world. In 18, 1 - 8 we see the practical aim of the teaching. From now on the time of the Parousia can no longer present to the Church a problem on which it might come to grief, for in view of the information in vv. 20f, it becomes impossible even to ask about it." (p. 125).

70 R. Schnackenburg, Gottes Herrschaft und Reich (Freiburg, 1959), pp. 92 - 97. Schnackenburg objects to Conzelmann's "pictorial present": "Nach den Basileia-Texten bei Lukas dürfte es zuwenig sein, nur von einer Gegenwart des Heils und einer bildhaften Gegenwart des Gottesreiches zu sprechen. . . . und wenn die Basileia auch keineswegs ihren Zukunftscharakter verliert, so wird ihre Anwesenheit im Wort der Verkündigung und in den

and G. E. Ladd.[71]

A substantial number of exegetes have continued to read "the kingdom of God is within you," meaning some variation on the theme adequately epitomized by A. Harnack, "Das Reich Gottes ist mitten unter euch, es ist eine stille, mächtige Gotteskraft in den Herzen."[72] So, for example, K. Weiss,[73] J. M. Creed,[74] B. H. Streeter,[75]

Machttaten doch schwerlich geleugnet. Damit wird die Gottesherrschaft nicht 'vergeschichtlicht' und mit der irdischen missionierenden Kirche identifiziert, auch nicht als spirituelles Heil verstanden; sie bleibt eine eschatologische Grösse, die aber schon mit Jesu Kommen wirksam wurde und es in der Sendung der Jünger weiter ist. Gerade das letzte dürfte ein von Lukas gesetzter Akzent sein. Der "Historiker" unter den Evangelisten zieht die heilsgeschichtliche Linie aus, aber doch nicht so, dass die Gegenwart nur eine Vorbereitung auf die künftige Gottesherrschaft wäre; auch für ihn wirken ihre Kräfte schon im voraus und manifestieren sich in den gegenwärtigen Heilsgütern, vor allem im Heiligen Geist." (p. 95f).

[71] G. E. Ladd, The Gospel of the Kingdom (Grand Rapids, 1959), p. 17.

[72] A. Harnack, Das Wesen des Christentums III (Leipzig, 1900), 35.

[73] K. Weiss, Exegetisches zur Irrtumlosigkeit und Eschatologie Jesu (Leipzig, 1916), p. 163.

[74] J. M. Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke (London, 1930), p. 219. Creed insists that it is "precarious to use this text as a key to the meaning of the kingdom of God in the mind of Jesus [where it would mean either 'already at work' or 'suddenly will be]. . . . whatever actual saying of Jesus may lie behind these words, it may be that Luke [italic the present writer's] believed that Jesus set the spiritual presence of the Kingdom in men's hearts in antithesis to the expectation of its appearance 'here' or 'there.' But even if this is so, the eschatological conception is by no means superseded in the mind of the evangelist, or eliminated from his Gospel."

[75] B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels (London, 1936), p. 290.

A. T. Cadoux,[76] H. Clavier,[77] M. Meinertz,[78] W. L. Knox,[79]

---

[76]A. T. Cadoux, The Theology of Jesus (London, 1940), p. 290.

[77]H. Clavier, L' Acces au Royaume de Dieu (Paris, 1944), pp. 13ff. Clavier relates the Lucan pericope to Rm 14, 17 and writes: "Ce n'est pas un Règne lointain; il est à votre portée, comme Dieu lui meme, qui n'est pas un Dieu de loin, mais de près. A l'immanence de l'un répond l'immanence de l'autre, sans détruire ni contredire la transcendence." (p. 17).

[78]M. Meinertz, Theologie des Neuen Testamentes (Bonn, 1950), p. 34f. Meinertz explains, "Gewöhnlich wendet man gegen diese Erklärung ein, dass Jesus doch nicht sagen konnte, das Gottesreich lebe im Herzen der Angeredeten, d.h. der Pharisäer. Allein das braucht man aus dem Zusammenhange auch nicht herauszulesen. Jesus will einfach sagen, dass das Reich im Gegensatz zum äusseren Beobachten und Lokalisieren seine Wirkungsphäre im Herzen der Menchen habe."

[79]W. L. Knox, The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels II (Cambridge, 1957), 108 - 110. Knox conceives of the kingdom here as an inward spiritual state, but not "in the Hellenized sense of Oxy. P. 654." According to Knox, "there is no reason to suppose that it [the saying in Lk 17, 20f] does not date from the period when Jesus was on quite friendly terms with the Pharisees and that it does not record a genuine incident, though one that had no connexion with the apocalypse . . . . . we have to recognize . . . a saying which survived although it implied a situation which had really become unintelligible in the light of the later development of the quarrel between the Church and the religious leaders of Judaism as a result of the Crucifixion." (p. 108) Knox also holds that Rm 14, 17 derives from this text and similar passages, rather than vice-versa. The kingdom of God is an eschatological force at work on earth in virtue of the fact that it is at work in the souls of those who accept it.

E. A. McDowell,[80] and C. H. Dodd.[81]

In 1948 on the basis of evidence from the papyri and elsewhere, C. H. Roberts[82] provided in the form of philological

---

[80] E. A. McDowell, "Jesus' Concept of the Kingdom of God," Review and Expositor 57 (1960), 140ff. It must be said that McDowell betrays a singular innocence regarding contemporary studies on Lk 17, 20f. For McDowell, Luke employs ἐντός "to emphasize the inner spiritual nature of the kingdom when accepted and realized in the life of the individual . . . (p. 148). The kingdom remains . . . the invisible and spiritual reign of the sovereign God. . . . History and the messianic kingdom are consummated at the Parousia, but not the kingdom of God." (p. 152).

[81] C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom (New York, 1961), pp. 62, 63. Since Dodd does not consider Lk 17, 20f one of the passages clearly belonging to the oldest tradition, he does not adduce it in support of his theory of "realized" eschatology. As in former editions of Parables, the author holds that "the Kingdom of God is said not to be localized in space because it is ἐντὸς ὑμῶν . . . . the ultimate reality, though it is revealed in history, essentially belongs to the spiritual order, where categories of space and time are not applicable." (p. 63). Dodd does admit as possible the conclusion of C. H. Roberts (see below) in which case the passage would mean that "the Kingdom . . . is an available possibility here and now for those who are willing to 'receive it as a little child.'" (p. 63).

[82] C. H. Roberts, "The Kingdom of Heaven (Lk. XVII.21)," HarvTR 41 (1948), 1 - 8. Roberts's evidence and conclusions are discussed in chapter three of the present work. Here, briefly, the meaning of Lk 17, 21b is that "the kingdom is a present reality, but only if you wish it to be so . . . not independent of volition and action . . . a conditional possession." (p. 8).

support a new respectability for the patristic interpretation, "the kingdom of God is within your power." Roberts's conclusions are finding an increasingly wide acceptance, judging by the most recent commentaries and the latest English version of the NT.[83] Among the adherents of Roberts's version may be listed H. J. Cadbury,[84] A. R. C. Leaney,[85]

---

[83] The New English Bible: NT (Oxford, 1961), p. 132. It is perhaps well to state here that Roberts's position has received competent unfavorable criticism as well: cf. H. Riesenfeld, "ΕΜΒΟΛΕΥΕΙΝ. ΕΝΤΟΣ," Nuntius Sodalicii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis 2 (1949), 111f; A. Wikgren, "ΕΝΤΟΣ," ibid. 4 (1950), 27ff; J. G. Griffiths, "ἐντὸς ὑμῶν (Luke XVII 21)" ExpT 63 (1951), 30 - 31.

[84] H. J. Cadbury, "Luke 17, 21," Christian Century 67 (1950), 172f. Cf. however, "Acts and Eschatology," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge, 1956), p. 315 where Cadbury writes, "The answer [to the Pharisee's question], whatever the phrase ἐντὸς ὑμῶν means, is not an emphatic change of time from future to present. The tense of the Pharisees is not what Jesus corrects, but the reliance on 'observation.'" It is futile, of course, to attempt a delineation of Cadbury's opinion from his The Making of Luke-Acts (London, 1958) because it is actually a reprint of the 1927 publication (as Cadbury explains in the preface), though the publisher has insisted upon calling it a second edition.

[85] A. R. C. Leaney, A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke (London, 1958), p. 230. Leaney sees in the use of μετὰ παρατηρήσεως (v. 20b) a word-play: the kingdom comes neither by observation (meticulous keeping of tradition) nor by watching (the hostile attempt to catch). Rather that for which the Pharisees imply they are looking lies before their very eyes, i.e. is "within their grasp." For Lk's contemporaries: in the account of Jesus the Church has its inalienable example or picture of the kingdom; therefore it can hold out in the world (18, 1 - 8); "its [the Church's] kingdom does not come with observation; it has it potentially already."

and A. Rüstow.[86]

In an effort to determine what may be called the pericope's Sitz im Leben Ecclesiae, A. Strobel shifts attention from v. 21b to the phrase οὐκ — μετὰ παρατηρήσεως (v. 20b). For Strobel what is of special significance is the fact that παρατήρησις means "observation" and has a technical calendaric meaning; secondarily it probably also signifies a cultic observance, but never an apocalyptic calculation. Lk 17, 20f is a Lucan composition directed against the early Syro-Palestinian Christian connection of the Parousia with the date of the Passover.

So far as v. 21b is concerned, Strobel restricts himself to the Lucan use of the saying:

> Die Stelle erweist sich so innerhalb der Evangelienüberlieferung als merkürdige Ausnahme. Ihre Eigentümlichkeit liegt

---

[86] A. Rüstow, " ΕΝΤΟΣ ΥΜΩΝ ΕΣΤΙΝ ; Zur Deutung von Lukas 17, 20 - 21," ZNW 51 (1960), 216ff. Rüstow differs from Roberts only in that he strongly accents the future character of the kingdom: "Es ist sinnlos, auf die Parusie zu lauern, den Zeitpunkt ihres Eintritts im voraus berechnen oder dessen Ort bestimmen zu wollen: 'denn siehe, das Reich Gottes steht in eurer Hand,' es liegt bei euch, sich seiner würdig zu erweisen, um, wenn es kommt, darein aufgenommen zu werden, die Eintrittsbedingungen zu erfüllen: μετανοεῖτε, ἤγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ." (p. 216). Rüstow does not seem to realize that in his central argument (ἐντὸς ὑμῶν means "within your power" et sim.), he is only repeating Roberts's position. His assertion that Roberts " . . . kommt selbst doch nicht zu einer klaren und eindeutigen Entscheidung . . . " is incomprehensible. Additional weaknesses in Rüstow's study are pointed out by A. Strobel, "In dieser Nacht (Luk 17, 34)," ZTKir 58 (1961), 25 - 30.

> darin, dass die Gegenwärtigkeit des Reiches Gottes zum Zeitpunkt des Gespräches ohne die geringste Einschränkung festgestellt wird. Als Garant dieses Tatbestandes wird Christus betrachtet. Für die lukanische Darstellung ist dies auf jeden Fall als zugrundeliegende Intention anzunehmen.[87]

Finally, a segment of commentators either eliminates altogether the time element from Lk 17, 21b or, at least, radically reduces the importance of time in the pericope, or, better, denies its relevance. Thus, for example,

---

[87] A. Strobel, "Die Passa-Erwartung als urchristliches Problem in Lc 17, 20f," ZNW 49 (1958), 158f. It must be remarked that Strobel does not use the phrase Sitz im Leben Ecclesiae, but it is eminently appropriate for characterizing his point of view. Chapter three of the present work includes a discussion of Strobel's interpretation of παρατήρησις; for the present, it should be noted that H. Conzelmann (Die Mitte der Zeit, 3rd ed. [Tübingen, 1960], p. 114) emphatically rejects Strobel's central thesis: "Um die jüdische Passa-Haggada kümmert er [Lukas] sich nicht weil er sie gar nicht kennt [wie z.B. sein Passionsbericht zeigt]." Cf. Strobel's reply in "In dieser Nacht," ZTKir 58 (1961), 26. As Strobel later discovered, and was quick to acknowledge, his interpretation is not absolutely new; it was proposed as a serious possibility by A. Merx in 1905. Cf. A. Strobel, "A. Merx über Lk 17, 20f.," ZNW 51 (1960), 133, 134.

K. L. Schmidt,[88] H. B. Sharman,[89] and O. Cullmann.[90]

---

[88]K. L. Schmidt, "βασιλεία," ThWNT I, 587. The Lucan passage under discussion has, for Schmidt, its point solely in the rejection of calculations. The question as to whether there is intended any emphasis on the kingdom's being already present at the moment of the conversation cannot be argued, especially since in the original Aramaic wording there would have been no copula expressed.

[89]H. B. Sharman, Son of Man and Kingdom of God (London, 1944), p. 135. According to Sharman, the kingdom of God as conceived by Jesus is "timeless . . . something belonging to the Past-Present-Future."

[90]O. Cullmann, "L' avvento presente o futuro del Regno di Dio nel messaggio di Gesù," Protestantesimo 15 (1960), 72:

Non è sicuro che questa traduzione di ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ["dentro di voi"] sia esatta, ma neanche a me sembra che la parola interessi direttamente la questione del presente e del futuro, ma piuttosto la questione che riguarda la precisazione della data della parousia, che è in qualche modo collegata al problema. . . . Il Regno di Dio non è ancora venuto, ma è già venuto colui che porterà il Regno di Dio." (p. 73).

On the basis of other texts, Cullmann concludes that "Gesù calcola dunque l'esistenza di un tempo intermedio caratterizzato dal fatto che l'avvenimento decisivo si è già verificato, ma non è ancora manifestato in modo definitivo. Anche i giudei avevano già annunciato che il Regno di Dio era imminente. La novità della predicazione di Gesù è la ragione dell'imminenza: il Regno è vicino, perchè Cristo è già venuto, perchè con la venuta di Cristo, il tempo ha fatto un salto in avanti. . . . Il legame fra Gesù e la chiesa primitiva sta . . . nel fatto che entrambi hanno fondato la speranza del futuro sulla fede in ciò che è già avvenuto. Non è importante la durata del tempo intermedio, ma è importante che questo tempo intermedio ci sia, tempo durante, il quale vale il "già adimpiuto" e vale il "non ancora manifestato." E' questo l'importante tanto per la communità primitiva quanto per il tempo nel quale viviamo oggi. La morte a già vinta da Cristo, perciò speriamo nel definitivo annientamento della morte." (p. 76).

Seen in the perspective of the above statements and in the light of Cullmann's well-known "Victory Day" analogy (cf.

Conclusions

The foregoing conspectus of trends in the interpretation of Lk 17, 20f permits four generalizations of an historical nature:

(1) Except in very recent years, the focus of attention has always been v. 21b.

(2) During the patristic period and middle ages the use of the text was largely homiletic or apologetical and resulted in three more or less distinct understandings of v. 21b.

(3) The Reformation centuries found in the passage a useful tool for polemics, but no new light was shed on exegetical problems.

(4) In the wake of a new interest in scientific exegesis and since the advent of an intense preoccupation with eschatology, expressed acutely in the polarities of "konsequent" eschatology and "realized" eschatology and the reactions to each respectively, a plethora of theologians and

---

loc. cit., p. 71 or Christ and Time tr. F. Filson [Philadelphia, 1950], pp. 84ff), it appears certain that, for Cullmann, Lk 17, 20f is one expression of what he terms "the primitive Christian outlook": a rejection of hasty determinations of the date of the Parousia because the decisive battle (the death and resurrection of Christ) has already taken place (cf. Christ and Time, p. 88); the complex of questions concerning the expectation of the imminent end and delay of the Parousia has lost its importance, not from a psychological point of view, but in its theological bearing (cf. Christ and Time, p. 90).

exegetes have risen to debate the internal, external, apocalyptic, eschatological, future or present character of the kingdom as visualized in Lk 17, 20f and to argue the proper meaning of ἐντὸς ὑμῶν .

CHAPTER III

THE MEANING OF μετὰ παρατηρήσεως AND ἐντὸς ὑμῶν

From the history of the interpretation of Lk 17, 20 - 21, it is evident that μετὰ παρατηρήσεως and ἐντὸς ὑμῶν are key phrases for the understanding of the passage. Hence, prior to any feasible exegesis of the pericope, sound procedure demands the establishment (albeit inescapably tentative) of the meaning of these phrases in the context of Lk 17, 20f. The task of determining the content of μετὰ παρατηρήσεως and ἐντὸς ὑμῶν is here made more difficult because the noun παρατήρησις is a <u>hapax</u> in the NT, and the preposition ἐντός occurs only once outside Lk 17, 20f, viz. in Mt 23, 26: καθάρισον πρῶτον τὸ ἐντὸς τοῦ ποτηρίου where it certainly means "inside of."

<u>Texts and Versions</u>

However, before turning to OT and extra-biblical evidence for help in clarifying the meanings of the two phrases, attention must be directed briefly to the state of the text itself and to the witness of ancient versions.

First, with reference to the pericope as a whole, the manuscript evidence for Lk 17, 20f is unanimous, i.e. the passage is not lacking in any MS containing this section of the third gospel.[1] Second, it is generally conceded that the few variants within the textual tradition are exegetically insignificant.[2]

---

[1] Observations regarding the state of the text may be verified in A. Merk, NT Graece et Latine[8] (Rome, 1959), p. 269; E. Nestle, NT Graece[23] (Stuttgart, 1959), p. 202; C. Tischendorff, NT Graece I (Leipzig, 1872), 633, 634; H. von Soden, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments II (Göttingen, 1913), 341.

[2] Some scholars (e.g. G. Dalman, Die Worte Jesu I [Leipzig, 1930], p. 116) regard the unanimously attested ἐροῦσιν (v. 21a) as unsuitable where it stands and assert that the whole clause (v. 21a) is probably an interpolation introduced from v. 23. The present writer finds the hypothesis of an interpolated v. 21a most unlikely for two reasons: (a) the clause is found in all MSS; (b) ἐροῦσιν is not unsuitable; it is parallel to ἔρχεται (v. 20b) which is a present form with a future meaning sufficient to answer the Pharisees' question. As a matter of fact, v. 21a may very well have been one of the reasons for Lk's having juxtaposed vv. 20, 21 and vv. 22 - 37. On the other hand, on the hypothesis that v. 21a was not in Lk's source, the present writer would admit the possibility of Lk's having inserted v. 21a in order to link more closely the two pericopes: the coming of the kingdom (vv. 20, 21) and the apocalyptic discourse (vv. 22 - 37).

D adds ἰδοὺ (cf. 17, 23) after ἤ in v. 21a and μὴ πιστεύσητε after ἐκεῖ (cf. Mt 24, 23; Mk 13, 21; Lk 17, 23).

Leaving aside Oxy. P. 654,2 which has been discussed in chapter two of the present work and which, in any case, is not a version properly speaking but an ancient witness to a Gnostic understanding of the text, consideration is due the ancient versions.[3]

As a matter of fact, the versions shed as much light on the trials of translators as on the understanding of the text. The Latin tradition is constant both for the Vetus Latina and the Clementine Vulgate:

> non venit regnum Dei cum observatione;
> neque dicent ecce hic aut ecce illic.
> ecce enim regnum Dei intra vos est.[4]

There is a divergence in the Syriac tradition concerning the disputed phrase in v. 21b. Whereas the Peshitto[5] has

---

[3]It appears to be all but certain now that Oxy. P. 654 (et al.) is not originally Greek but a translation from Coptic. Cf. G. Garitte, "Les 'Logoi' d'Oxyrhynque et l'apocryphe copte dit 'Evangile de Thomas,'" Le Muséon 73 (1960), 151 - 172; idem., Les 'Logoi' d'Oxyrhynque sont traduit du copte," ibid., pp. 335 - 349; K. Kuhn, "Some Observations on the Coptic Gospel According to Thomas," ibid., pp. 317 - 323; contra: A. Guillaumont, "Les Logia d'Oxyrhynchos sont-ils traduit du copte?" ibid., pp. 325 - 333. The present writer thanks Msgr. P. W. Skehan (Department of Semitics and Egyptology, Catholic University of America) for calling his attention to these important studies. In the light of them, Rüstow's reconstruction of Oxy. P. 654,2 (loc. cit., p. 221f) is all the more unlikely.

[4]A. Merk, op. cit., p. 269; J. Wordsworth and H. White, Novum Testamentum DNJC Latine (Oxford, 1898), pp. 428, 429.

[5]B. Walton (ed.), Biblia Sacra Polyglotta (London, 1657), p. 352.

بينكم which, in the opinion of this writer, is preferably rendered "within you," in the sense of the Latin intra, the Sinaitic and Curetonian versions read بينكم, which can only mean "among you" or "in the midst of you."[6]

There is no critical edition of the Ethiopic NT. Two reliable editions agree perfectly, however, on the rendering of the difficult phrases in Lk 17, 20f:

> And there asked him [the] Pharisees and said to him
> When comes the kingdom of God
> And (he) answered and said to them
> Not comes the kingdom of God with watching
> [keeping/caution (inf.)]
> And they do not say of it, 'Behold it here'
> and/or 'Behold it there'
> The kingdom of God however behold it
> amidst you it (is).[7]

---

[6] F. C. Burkitt, Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe I (Cambridge, 1904), 364. Cf. ibid., p. 298: "This verse 17, 21b is noteworthy for the fact that the Peshitta and the Ev. da-Merpharreshe and the Diatessaron are all extant and all different. . . . This [ἐντὸς ὑμῶν] is translated 'among you' in S and C, but the Diatessaron has 'within your heart.' (p. 198). . . . Here . . . the Peshitta agrees with neither rendering, having 'in the midst of you.'" (p. 198n.1). It is not clear to this writer that Burkitt's translation of the Peshitto ("in the midst of you") is not a bit misleading. It would seem that had the Syriac wished to express Burkitt's version, it would have employed بينكم and not بينكم. Cf. Ex 17, 7 "Is the Lord in our midst (Peshitto: بينكم) or not?" Hence this writer's option for some form of "within" that is not necessarily restricted to an immanent sense of "inside of." Cf., for example, R. Payne Smith's Thesaurus Syriacus I (Oxford, 1879), col. 666 which offers some phrases (e.g. intra tres menses) with بينكم that are almost parallel to the Peshitto Luke 17, 21b.

[7] Transliterated: watas' elewô Farîsâwᵉyân wayᵉbêlewô/ mâ'ezê temase' mangesta' Egzî'abᵉhêr/wa'awse' a wayᵉbêlômû/

By way of contrast, the Coptic versions render as "inside":

> v. 20b . . . the kingdom of God is not coming by observation [Sahidic] . . . was not to come with [lit. "in"] observation [Bohairic].
>
> v. 21b . . . for behold, the kingdom of God (is) inside you [Sahidic]. . . (is) inside of you [Bohairic].[8]

Modern Aramaic and Hebrew versions of Lk 17, 20f simply compound the difficulties of the ancient versions. For v. 20b Dalman offers as a possible translation: מלכותא דשמיא לית היא אתיא בדמיר with בדמיר in the sense of "observe, watch for" (compare the Sinaitic, Curetonian, and Peshitto Syriac ܒܫܘܡܐ , i.e. "with observation"). Dalman also suggests as more idiomatic כדנפלין לה , i.e. "if one

---

'îtemase' mangesta Egzi ab^{e}her bata aqebo/wa iyebelewa naya zeya wanaya kahak/mangesta 'Egzî'ab^{e}hêrsa nayâ ma'eklēkemû ye'etî. NT DNJC'aethiopice (ed.) T. Platt (Leipzig, 1899), p. 139. The Catholic edition (The Holy Gospel of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ [Asmara, 1912], p. 153) is identical with the above except for omitting "of it" as a suffix for "do not say" (hence, wa'îyebêlû) in v. 21. Again, the writer is indebted to the good offices of Msgr. P. W. Skehan, who compared the Ethiopic editions and transliterated and translated the passage.

[8] G. Horner, The Coptic Version of the NT: [Sahidic and Thebaic] II (Oxford, 1911), 329; idem., The Coptic Version of the NT II: Memphitic and Bohairic (Oxford, 1898), p. 233. Should the reader wish to compare other Coptic versions of Lk 17, 20f, he will find them in P. Kahle, Bala'izah (Oxford, 1954); The Book of the NT (Cairo, 1934); The Holy Book: NT (Cairo, 1935); HarvTR 26 (1933), 99ff. Cf. W. C. Till, "Coptic

lies in wait for it."[9]

For v. 21b Dalman eventually decides in favor of the Aramaic rendering דְּהָא מַלְכוּתָא דִשְׁמַיָּא בְּגַוְכוֹן הִיא

However, he admits the possibility of בֵּינֵיכוֹן "among you" because although the Targums translate Hebrew בְּקֶרֶב as בְּגַו when it is followed by a substantive, it is generally rendered בֵּינֵי when it is attached to a pronominal suffix.[10] As C. H. Roberts has noted, it is precisely the ambiguity of the Aramaic that may have caused the difficulty in the Syriac.[11] At any rate it is clear that Dalman's final choices for the re-translation of the difficult phrases in Lk 17, 20 are dictated more by his interpretation of the pericope than by any other considerations.

Salkinson's Hebrew version translates μετὰ παρατηρήσεως as עִם עֵינֵי הַמַּבִּיט and leaves the question of "within you" or "among you" open by offering בְּקִרְבְּכֶם.[12]

Biblical Texts Published after Vaschalde's Lists," BJRylL 42 (1960), 221ff.

[9]G. Dalman, Die Worte Jesu (Leipzig, 1930), p. 118.

[10]Ibid., pp. 118, 119.

[11]C. H. Roberts, "The Kingdom of Heaven (Lk XVII.21)," HarvTR 41 (1948), 5.

[12]I. Salkinson and K. Ginsberg, Hebrew NT (London, 1894), p. 155.

It is clear that the ancient versions of Lk 17, 20b understand παρατήρησις to refer to some kind of observation or watching, but can the object of the observation or watching be specified? M. Dibelius has remarked, with reference to v. 20b, that " . . . it is the kingdom's signs that are meant, for they alone can be the object of apocalyptic 'observation' (παρατήρησις). The only problem that remains to be solved is whether these signs are already 'among you' or 'within you' . . . "[13] In a similar vein, W. G. Kümmel asserts that the meaning of ἐντὸς ὑμῶν "can be won only from the rejected antitheses οὐ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως and οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν· ἰδοὺ ὧδε ἢ ἐκεῖ," and then affirms that "it is clear what οὐ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως means, for the Hellenistic word παρατήρησις , which is not found elsewhere in the Greek Bible [sic], designates observation especially of premonitory signs and symptoms. So here a future time for the kingdom of God which can be more or less definitely determined is clearly rejected."[14] By way of contrast with the above opinions, that of A. R. C. Leaney may be cited. Leaney holds that although "the noun is

---

[13] M. Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, 3rd ed., ed. G. Bornkamm (Tübingen, 1959), p. 162n.2. (tr this writer's)

[14] W. G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfillment, tr. D. Barton (Naperville, 1957), p. 32.

known in biblical Greek only here and in Aquila's translation of Ex 12, 42 . . . the use of the verb in the LXX [sic] is enough to show that here there is a word-play between two senses of it: 'watch for' (i.e. try to catch) and 'observe' (i.e. keep sc. regulations)."[15]

There is enough discrepancy in the foregoing opinions to warrant a review of the evidence.

The Meaning of μετὰ παρατηρήσεως

It has been remarked earlier that παρατήρησις is hapax in the NT. Verbal forms of παρατηρεῖν, however, occur six times, four of which are in Luke-Acts: Mk 3, 2; Lk 6, 7; 14, 1; 20, 20; Acts 9, 24; and Gal 4, 10.[16] In every instance but one there is question of close watching or observation exercised by hostile Pharisees or others in an effort to trap Jesus (Mk 3, 2; Lk 6, 7; 14, 1; 20, 20) or murder Paul (Acts 9, 24). The exception is found in Gal 4, 10 where the act of observation means religious observation, i.e. the liturgical observance of the Jewish

---

[15] A. R. C. Leaney, A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke (NY, 1958), p. 230.

[16] A. Schmoller, Handkonkordanz zum Griechischen NT, 11th ed. (Stuttgart, n.d.), p. 385.

sacral cycle.[17]

It should be noted that nowhere in the NT does the verb παρατηρεῖν mean to indulge in apocalyptic calculations or to observe celestial movements or symptoms of disease. Where it is employed it means either to observe intently for a malicious purpose or to observe religiously.

The LXX lacks altogether the substantive παρατήρησις,[18] but verbal forms of παρατηρεῖν occur six times:

Ps 36 (37), 12 παρατηρήσεται ὁ ἁμαρτωλὸς τὸν δίκαιον

129 (130), 3 [A S] ἐὰν ἀνομίας παρατηρήσῃ [R -σῃς]

---

[17] The lengths to which an author will sometimes go in order to support a hypothesis are aptly illustrated by A. Strobel ("Die Passa-Erwartung als urchristliches Problem in Lc 17, 20f," ZNW 49 [1958], 163, 164) in his analysis of Gal 4, 10. Strobel asserts that the "Verb παρατηρεῖν Gal 4, 10 die (durch Himmelsbeobachtung gewonne) Kalenderbestimmung [italic, this writer's] bezeichnet (ἡμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε, καὶ μῆνας καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἐνιαυτούς), wobei der Gedanke des religiös verbindlichen Einhaltens mitschwingt, beleuchtet den Sprachgebrauch des Pauluskreises, dem auch Lukas zuzuordnen ist." That παρατηρεῖσθε here means calendar-determination is quite without foundation. To observe religious practices within the framework of a liturgical cycle is by no stretch of the imagination synonymous with computing the parts of that cycle. Obviously, the observance is related to the cycle, but that is a totally different question. It is clear from the context of Gal 4 that Paul is taking Christians to task for Judaic religious observances. Cf. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich's A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Chicago, 1957), p. 628 which lists the same use of the verb (i.e. to indicate religious observance, not calendaric calculation) in Josephus, Ant. 3, 91 παρατηρεῖν τὰς ἑβδομάδας; 14, 264 παρατηρεῖν τὴν τῶν σαββάτων ἡμέραν.

[18] E. Hatch and A. Redpath, A Concordance to the LXX II (Oxford, 1897), 1065.

Dn (Su) v. 12 παρετηροῦσαν φιλοτίμως καθ' ἡμέραν ὁρᾶν αὐτήν
v. 15 ἐν τῷ παρατηρεῖν αὐτοὺς ἡμέραν εὔθετον
v. 16 οἱ δύο πρεσβύτεροι κεκρυμμένοι καὶ παρατηροῦντες αὐτήν.

Dn 6, 11 (12) οἱ ἄνδρες ἐκεῖνοι παρετήρησαν καὶ εὗρον τὸν Δανιηλ ἀξιοῦντα καὶ δεόμενον τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ.

From the various contexts it is clear that where the LXX employs παρατηρεῖν , it does so to convey the sense of intensive observation or watching to facilitate an evil purpose (Ps 36, 37, 12; Dn (Su) v. 12.15.16; 6, 11 12) or simply marked observation that carries with it the sense of "taking note of" (Ps 129 [130], 3). It must be remarked (contra Leaney) that nowhere in the LXX is the verb παρατηρεῖν employed to mean "observe (keep sc. regulations)." Nor does the LXX use παρατηρεῖν to convey the idea of calendaric calculation, apocalyptic reckoning, observation of celestial movements or premonitory signs or symptoms of illness.

An examination of other ancient Greek versions of the OT reveals that verbal forms of παρατηρεῖν occur twice in Symmachus and once in Theodotian:[19]

Σ 1 Kgs 1, 12 [Ἠλι] παρατηρῶν τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς [Ἄννα]

Σ Ps 55 (56), 7 τὰ ἴχνη μοῦ παρετήρουν

---

[19] F. Field (ed.), Origenis Hexaplorum I - II (Oxford, 1875), in loc.

Θ Dn 6, 15 τότε οἱ ἄνδρες ἐκεῖνοι παρετηρήσαντο —

Again, it is a question of marked observation or taking note of someone's actions (1 Kgs 1, 12), sometimes with evil intent (Ps 55 (56), 7; Dn 6, 15).

Special attention is due the versions of Ex 12, 42a by Aquila and Symmachus. For the significant phrase לַיהוָה הוּא לֵיל שִׁמֻּרִים[20] the following renditions occur:

A νὺξ παρατηρήσεως ἦν τῷ ΙΗΩΥ

Σ νὺξ παρατετηρημένη ἐστὶ τῷ ΙΗΩΥ

In each instance the translator was faced with a text that speaks of a "night of vigil,"[21] which in the context (cf. v. 42b) means "a night to be observed," i.e. liturgically, in honor of Yahweh. There is no indication in the Hebrew text that what is meant is that this is a night to be on the lookout for Yahweh. Again, a comparison of the Hebrew text of v. 42b with the versions of Aquila and Symmachus is instructive:[22]

הוּא־הַלַּיְלָה הַזֶּה לַיהוָה שִׁמֻּרִים

A Σ αὕτη ἡ νὺξ αὕτη τῷ ΙΗΩΥ παρατηρήσεως

---

[20] Ibid., I, 102.

[21] L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros II (Grand Rapids, 1953), 994.

[22] Field, loc. cit.

At this point it is perhaps not beyond the limits of the discussion to recall the standard observation that in the versions of Aquila and Symmachus (as in other Greek versions) it is a question of translation Greek, that the translator has attempted to convey his understanding of the Hebrew text by means of the most suitable Greek vocabulary at his disposal. Of special significance for the present investigation of the possible meanings of παρατήρησις is the fact that Aquila (twice: v. 42a 42b) and Symmachus (once: v. 42b) employ the substantive. The inescapable conclusion would seem to be that they mean "religious observance," or "liturgical observation," as does the Hebrew. This sense is therefore parallel to that of the verb already discussed with reference to Gal 4, 10.[23]

---

[23]The reader may wonder at the present writer's insistent elaboration of this point. The reason for what may appear to be an unnecessarily involved and repetitious analysis lies in this writer's inability to accept the recent and often repeated thesis of A. Strobel ("Die Passa-Erwartung als unchristliches Problem in Lc 17, 20f," ZNW 49 [1958], 172f; "A. Merx über Lc 17, 20f," ZNW 51 [1960], 133f; "In dieser Nacht," ZTKir 58 [1961], 16ff) that Aquila is giving the phrase in Ex 12, 42a a technical calendaric sense consonant with late Judaism's Pasch Haggada, viz. that the date of the Passover is to be the date of the inauguration of the messianic era.

Stated briefly, Strobel's argument runs as follows: As is clear from first century rabbinic tradition, late Judaism believed the inauguration of the messianic era to be set for some 14 - 15 Nisan. The Passover night was therefore a "night of watching for Yahweh." Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotian were aware of this tradition and expressed it in their versions of Ex 12, 42a by employing παρατήρησις or a verbal

form of παρατηρεῖν in a technical calendaric sense. Since they (esp. Aquila, who is nearest in time to Luke and who employs the noun) are close to Lk's time, it may be inferred that the rejected παρατήρησις in v. 20b is a rejected calendaric Christian version of the Pasch Haggada, i.e. a rejection of the notion that the Parousia will take place on some νὺξ παρατηρήσεως, i.e. on some 14 - 15 Nisan.

That there existed the sort of Jewish expectation which Strobel describes appears certain. His study is richly documented on this point. Cf. e.g. Mekh Ex 12, 42 which attributes to Rabbi Jehoschua (after 70 a.d.) the comment that "diese Nacht (vom 14 zum 15 Nisan) ist eine Nacht der Beobachtungen für Jahwe. In ihr (in der messianischen Zeit) erlöst werden." (Strobel, "Die Passa-Erwartung . . . " p. 166; a convenient source for checking this text is J. Bonsirven's Textes Rabbiniques [Rome, 1955], p. 16).

For the hypothesis, however, that Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotian were adherents of this late liturgico-theological tradition there is no evidence. More significantly, the assertion that their versions reflect this tradition seems to the present writer completely gratuitous. Indeed the evidence is the contrary, for Aquila in particular was dedicated to a slavish rendering of his Hebrew source; for Ex 12, 42a he found in νὺξ παρατηρήσεως a suitably literal rendering of שִׁמֻּרִים לַיהוָה.

It is ünnecessary to predicate of παρατήρησις in Ex 12, 42a a meaning beyond that of the Hebrew it translates, i.e. the sense of "liturgical observance," and hence it is impossible for this writer to accept Strobel's conclusion that "παρατήρησις hat von dieser Verwendung her [i.e. in the context of the calendaric computation of the Passover with all its associations described above] ohne Zweifel einen technischen-kalendarischen Sinn, secundär wohl auch [italics, this writer's] kultischen Observanz . . ." (Die Passa-Erwartung . . . " p. 173).

So far as Lk 17, 20b is concerned, it will be recalled that the text reads μετὰ παρατηρήσεως and not μετὰ νυκτὸς παρατηρήσεως. If the evangelist was primarily taken with an effort to combat a Christian misconception of the Paschal vigil as such, why was he not more explicit?

The verb παρατηρεῖν , meaning to observe religiously, is also found in the fifth logion of Oxy. P. 654. Here again (cf. note 17 of the present chapter) the observance is in terms of Jewish observance. Oxy. P. 654:5 presents the disciples of Jesus as wondering to what extent they, as his followers, are to retain Jewish practices as the external observances of their religion. They ask about fasting, prayer, almsgiving, and then (according to Fitzmyer's reconstruction on the basis of the Coptic Gospel According to Thomas):

— τί παρατηρήσ[ομεν ὅταν δειπ]

[νωμε]ν;[24]

which Fitzmyer renders, " . . . what shall we observe when we sup?"[25]

A relatively thorough exploration of possible meanings for μετὰ παρατηρήσεως should also include data from other

---

Moreover, any attempt to determine the meaning of μετὰ παρατηρήσεως must not neglect the very important consideration that Lk too is working ultimately with translation Greek. Hence greater weight must be given the various meanings that παρατήρησις would have if employed to express something like the Aramaic בְּמִשְׁמוֹרִים or Hebrew בְּמִשְׁמֶרֶת, neither of which has a technical calendaric sense, but each of which can mean (among other things) "with religious observance."

[24] J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Oxyrhynchus Logoi of Jesus and the Coptic Gospel According to Thomas," TS 20 (1959), 528. The Coptic version of this line is essentially the same, " . . . and what shall we observe [παρατηρεῖ] in eating?" (p. 527).

[25] Ibid.

extra-biblical Greek sources.[26] It has been noted that Josephus employs the verb, meaning by it "to observe religiously"; he also uses the noun to indicate observation of symptoms of illness (Bell. 1, 570) and to indicate the observance of legal prescriptions (Ant. 8. 96 παρατήρησις τῶν νομίμων).

In non-Jewish literature the verb παρατηρεῖν may mean simply to watch someone to see what he does (Xen. Mem. 3, 14, 4); to observe religiously (Cass. Dio 53, 10, 3). The noun is used to mean observation of stars (Polyb. 16, 22, 8); observation of the future by certain signs (Diod. S. 5, 31, 3);[27] observation of symptoms of illness (Inscriptiones Graecae IV, 1, 687); and observance of legal prescriptions, especially of festivals (Diognetus 4, 5).

Conclusions

If the ancient versions of μετὰ παρατηρήσεως are compared with the use of παρατήρησις and παρατηρεῖν

---

[26] The citations that follow are taken from Arndt-Gingrich, op. cit., p. 628.

[27] It is this sense which many commentators (e.g. Weiss, Julicher, Dibelius) wish to attribute to v. 20b of Lk 17. Thus it is worth noting that Arndt-Gingrich (op. cit., p. 628) cites no instance in which biblical authors or even extra-biblical authors (with the exception of some pagan writers) so employ it. The rarity of the term's being used to mean the observation of the future by certain signs does not, of course, rule out the possibility of Lk's having used it in this sense.

in the biblical and extra-biblical contexts just cited, it is at once clear that all the evidence leads to the same general conclusion, viz. that the Lucan phrase must mean a "close watching" or "careful observance" of some kind.

Another general conclusion to which the present investigation leads (one that is rarely adverted to) is that the close watching or close observation always has as its direct object a present reality, i.e. someone or some thing or a whole complex present to the person indulging in the act of παρατήρησις. Every example cited above bears out this conclusion. Two passages in particular may be recalled, however, simply because at first sight they might appear to be exceptions to the principle: Lk 20, 20 and Acts 9, 24. In Lk 20, 20 the scribes and high priests after hearing the parable of the vineyard are described as wishing to arrest Jesus but forbear because they fear the populace. Instead they "carefully observed" (παρατηρήσαντες) Jesus's activities so as to find an opportunity to insert spies in his audience.[28]

The strictly literal sense of παρατηρεῖν is not "to be

---

[28] E. Goodspeed (The Complete Bible: NT Chicago, 1951, p. 78) renders the phrase very well by "So they kept watch of him . . ."; presumably since the object is not expressed, the NEB: NT (Oxford, 1961) renders "So they watched their opportunity . . ." In the opinion of this writer the latter translation obscures the meaning of παρατηρεῖν. Lk's idea is that they "were watching" Jesus' activities (present to them) and found an opportunity (unexpressed) to send their agents.

on the lookout for," but "to observe intently an object present to the observer." Similarly in Acts 9, 24 the reader is informed that the Jews "kept watching" (παρετηροῦντο) the gates of the city so as to intercept and murder Paul. Again, the strictly literal sense is "to observe intently an object present to the observer."

As was suggested earlier in this chapter, the principal difficulty in interpreting the Lucan phrase μετὰ παρατηρήσεως with any confidence lies in the fact that there is specified neither the object[29] of careful watching nor the character of the activity (if, for instance, Lk means the act of observing a person carefully, does he also mean maliciously?).

Yet even at this stage further conclusions are in order, for taking into account the Lucan context and the ultimately Semitic background of the phrase, the possibilities are, in the light of the evidence from biblical and extra-biblical sources, definitely limited. Thus, the kingdom of God, replies Jesus in answer to the Pharisees, does not come with marked observation[30]

---

[29]The subject of παρατήρησις is not specified either, but its identity is unmistakable in the context. Obviously the subject has to be either Jesus or his addressees. Only the latter as subject makes sense.

[30]That is, so that you can carefully take note of or scrutinize its coming. It will be recalled that the

Pharisees have asked when the kingdom is coming. Accordingly there would be in the present interpretation a denial of a time element, i.e. when the kingdom comes, its coming will not be such that you can scrutinize it.

On the other hand, if the kingdom is conceived of as present, the response would seem to mean, according to this interpretation, "not with your careful watching," i.e. it is already here, but your prejudices do not permit you to observe its growth and development before your very eyes.

In neither interpretation is it legitimate to conclude from the phrase μετὰ παρατηρήσεως to a purely immanentist conception of the kingdom, i.e. a state of mind or soul which, as C. H. Roberts has noted ("The Kingdom of Heaven," HarvTR 41 [1948], 2) is congenial to Stoicism, not to Christianity (cf. Seneca, Ep. 41, 2: "Prope est ad te deus, tecum est, intus est. Ita dico, Lucili, sacer intra nos spiritus sedet . . . "; cf. also Epictetus, Disc. 1, 14, 14; Marcus Aurelius, Med. 3, 5; 5, 10; 12, 1).

To put the matter more positively, the kingdom or rule or reign of God is a Hebrew concept. The reign is manifested in history and is expressed in human and temporal (and therefore visible) forms (cf. P. van Imschoot, "Reich Gottes," Bibel - Lexikon [ed. Haag], cols. 1412 - 1418; J. Hermann, "Reich Gottes," Calwer Bibel - Lexicon, fasc. 4 [Stuttgart, 1961], cols. 1094 - 1097). A. M. Hunter ("Interpreting the Parables: The Centrality of the Kingdom," Interpr 14 [1960], pp. 70 - 84; "The Gospel in Parables: The Coming of the Kingdom," ibid., pp. 167 - 185) has stated the matter succinctly: " . . . in reading the Gospels we are to think of the kingdom not as some moral disposition in the heart of man or some utopian society to be built by his efforts but as the decisive intervention of the living God on the stage of human history for man's salvation. . . . The 'good news' is . . . not so much a program for human action as the proclamation of an act of God in Jesus Christ . . . " (p. 84). The notion of God's rule in the world (and a fortiori his final and decisive intervention in human history) as limited to purely immanentist activity in the hearts of men is repugnant to what is known of the Semitic concept of the relationship between God and history (cf. B. W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament [Englewood Cliffs,

1957], pp. 1 - 90; J. L. McKenzie, The Two-Edged Sword [Milwaukee, 1956], pp. 60 - 71).

Granted that Lk's notion of the kingdom must be a Semitic one, can it be specified further? This question is only indirectly related to the interpretation of Lk 17, 20 - 21, but since it is indirectly related, it is perhaps as well to deal with it here. Allusion has been made to Schnackenburg's criticism of Conzelmann's "pictorially present" kingdom which the latter attributes to Lk (cf. chapter two of the present study, p. 24n. 69). It may be added here that Conzelmann does treat ex professo of Lk's concept of the kingdom of God (The Theology of St. Luke, tr. G. Buswell [New York, 1960], pp. 113 - 119).

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Conzelmann's section on Lk's concept of the kingdom of God is rather less successful than other parts of his work. Apart from a certain Teutonic obscurity that runs throughout the treatment, the author has set for himself what appears to this writer to be a highly questionable goal: the isolation of the concept of the kingdom of God germane to Lk (and contrasted with his sources). And since the author appears to be seeking a univocal concept, he is constantly faced with the problem of exceptions. For example, Conzelmann finds Lk's notion of the kingdom of God a transcendental and future reality (" . . . the Kingdom of God retains its transcendental character in Luke . . . its realization belongs to the future . . . "). Hence he must resort to a "pictorial present" to account for passages that seem to affirm a present kingdom ("What belongs to the present is the image of the kingdom." p. 119). Sometimes Conzelmann simply does not devote any attention to passages difficult to square with his thesis. Two such passages will suffice to illustrate the point. Conzelmann says with reference to the kingdom (op. cit., p. 114), "Luke is certainly familiar with the statement ἤγγικεν, but it is not part of the preaching [italics this writer's], but only of the secret [italics this writer's] instruction of the disciples." Now, the author is certainly referring to Lk 10, 9ff; hence it is incredible that he should have overlooked the fact that the instruction to the disciples is: λέγετε αὐτοῖς· ἤγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. And what of Lk's report of Jesus's statement to his opponents in the Beelzebub controversy that εἰ δὲ ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (11, 20)?

This writer's purpose here is not to defend for Lk a concept of the kingdom as a present reality. The point here is that any attempt to find in Lk a totally univocal concept of the kingdom is to forget what Lk has affirmed at the outset (1, 1 - 4), viz. that he is employing a number of sources. Of course he edits them and thus a stress on one or the other aspects of the kingdom is not strange. But he is also faithful to his sources and hence if what he admits to his opus is varied, there is nothing to do but take cognizance of the fact and proceed from there.

More concretely, the phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ occurs thirty-two times in Lk's gospel and six times in Acts (W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, A Concordance to the Greek Testament [Edinburgh, 1926], p. 142). The first striking characteristic of Lk's kingdom of God is that it is something the good news of which must be announced, preached after John the Baptist, explained, and spread (4, 43; 8, 1; 9, 2. 11. 60; 16, 16; Acts 8, 12; 19, 18; 28, 23. 31) sometimes with accompanying miracles (4, 43; 9, 2. 11). It is a topic of discussion between the risen Christ and his apostles (Acts 1, 3).

The kingdom of God has made its way to man (10, 9. 11; 11, 20) and it is of its nature to progress (13, 18. 20). It is something that one is in or enters (7, 28; 13, 28. 29; 18, 16. 17. 24. 25) though prospects are scanty for the rich (18, 24. 25). It is closed to some (13, 28. 29). From its members are demanded constancy (9. 62), childlike qualities (18, 16. 17), tribulation, perseverance (Acts 14, 22) and faith (Acts 8, 12). The kingdom of God is the reward of the humble (6, 20).

Noteworthy is the fact that in practically all of the passages cited above (exceptions: 6, 20; 13, 28; 18, 24?), the kingdom is conceived of as in the process of inauguration. More precisely, Lk writes of a present kingdom (10, 9. 11? 11, 20) or one being inaugurated (4, 43; 8, 1; 9, 2. 11. 60; 13, 18. 20; 16, 16; 18, 24. 25?; 23, 51? Acts 1, 3; 8, 12; 14, 22; 19, 8; 28, 23. 31). The references to the kingdom of God as a future reality are no less clear (9, 27; 19, 11; 21, 31). And, to be sure, there is no cogent reason why the evangelist should not with perfect liberty employ the same term to describe the new order that is being inaugurated and the final perfection of that order in the future.

Without denying the view of P. van Imschoot ("Reich Gottes," Bibel - Lexikon [ed. Haag], col. 1417) that

> Da er Jesus sich ald der kommende Richter der Welt, als König des zukünftigen Reiches fühlte, war dieses Reich schon gegenwärtig; in seinem Selbstbewusstsein vermählten sich Gegenwart und Zukunft, Zeitlichkeit und Ewigkeit. Deshalb konnte er seine Wiederkunft in der Herrlichkeit und den Anbruch des Reiches, das sich in seiner Person schon verwirklichte, als unmittelbar bevorstehend bezeichnen,

it may be concluded that according to the presentation of Lk, the kingdom of God is both a present reality and a future reality. It is a new order inaugurated on earth in the person, preaching and works of Jesus, an order that is to be continued and spread by his disciples, and an order that is to reach perfection in the final and decisive intervention known elsewhere as the Parousia.

Hence it seems clear from the compilation of kingdom-texts cited above that no exlusively present or future kingdom of God can with complete confidence be attributed to the thought of Lk. The temporal or atemporal aspect of the kingdom will therefore have to be determined from the context in each instance, and this is especially true of Lk 17, 20 - 21. C.H. Roberts has, in the opinion of this writer, accurately described the exegetical situation with reference to the kingdom in Lk 17, 20f. He writes ("The Kingdom of Heaven," HarvTR 41 [1948], 8), "To ask whether the kingdom is external, internal, a state of mind or society, a process or a catastrophic event is, in this [italics the present writer's] context, to ask the wrong question . . ." To repeat: the Pharisees ask when the kingdom is coming; Jesus replies in terms of how or where. Thus the pericope is not directly occupied with the nature of the kingdom as such. And this study therefore is not directly concerned with the nature of Lk's kingdom. It is concerned with the interpretation of Lk 17, 20 - 21. The notion of the kingdom that Lk employs within the pericope must emerge from the context itself, though it is to be expected that that notion will be consonant with one or the other of the various conceptions of the kingdom within the third gospel.

or with hostile watching[31] or with the intent watching of signs[32] or with religious observance.[33]

At this stage the resources of philology have provided invaluable insights; the limitations of μετὰ παρατηρήσεως have been determined for the context of

---

[31]That is, with your campaign of observation of my speech and actions, the only purpose of which is to find charges to bring against me (Lk 6, 7; 14, 1; 20, 20). The resemblance of 6, 6 - 11 to 14, 1 - 6 is striking. In each instance it is a Sabbath on which scribes and Pharisees watch Jesus to see if he will violate the prescriptions ruling the day. In each instance he asks a question of his opponents and receives no reply. In each instance Jesus then cures a man's physical ailment (6, 6ff withered arm; 14, 1ff dropsy). There are also differences (e.g. in 6, 6ff the site is the synagogue; in 14, 1ff the home of a Pharisee). Is it a question of two versions of one incident, the transference of details having been completed in each in the separate sources with which Lk is working?

[32]That is, with your observing signs by means of which you can determine the arrival of the kingdom. In Lk's gospel as a matter of fact Jesus does furnish signs and connect them with the coming of the kingdom in the presence of opponents (e.g. 11, 20), but not the sort of signs for which he is asked (11, 16; 11, 29 - 32; 21, 5 - 7). Hence in this interpretation the meaning could be that the kingdom doesn't come with the observation of the type of signs you want to observe. On the other hand, such an interpretation appears somewhat doubtful to this writer because for some reason the rejection of apocalyptic signs is milder in Lk (compare Mt 12, 38 - 42; 16, 1 - 4; and Mk 8, 11 - 12 with Lk 11, 16. 29 - 32). In this interpretation therefore it seems more likely that the meaning would be not with your observing the signs already offered you because you observe them only as possible violations of the Law.

[33]That is, with your scrupulously observing the legal and liturgical prescriptions of Judaism (cf. Gal 4, 10; cf. also Jesus's disregard in 6, 1 - 5. 6 - 11; 11, 37 - 42).

v. 20. But, as is now clear, any one of the four meanings can, with a few adjustments, be fitted into the context of the entire pericope. The final choice, if one is possible, must rest, however, not only with a meaning that is philologically unobjectionable and possible in the context, but also flexible enough to take into account the possibility that more than one meaning might be involved, not only in the sense of a double entendre, but also in the sense that Jesus might have used the phrase in one sense (supposing the historicity of the incident, which in any case must be determined from an analysis of the literary form that Lk employs), while Lk, for an alternate but not contradictory purpose, might have used the phrase in another sense. And what is here affirmed of a part of the pericope applies as well to the whole. The reliability of an interpretation depends then not only on an indispensably sound philological basis, but also upon an accurate as possible assessment of the particular literary form and its uses, both of which call into consideration the distinctions between the Sitz im Leben Jesu, the Sitz im Leben Ecclesiae, and the Sitz im Evangelium. This necessarily involved final step is the subject of chapter four of the present study.

Before the form-critical analysis is possible, however, there remains the necessity of searching for the possible

meanings of the traditional crux interpretum of Lk 17, 20f: ἐντὸς ὑμῶν (v. 21b).

The Meaning of ἐντὸς ὑμῶν

Attention has already been called to the fact that the preposition ἐντός occurs elsewhere in the NT only in Mt 23, 26a, where it certainly means "inside" as contrasted with "outside" (ἐκτός v. 26b). Yet the renderings in the ancient versions of ἐντὸς ὑμῶν (cf. pp. 2 - 3 of this chapter) reflect no more unanimity than do the early commentaries on v. 21b (cf. chapter two of this study). The fact is, as will be immediately evident, that any one of the interpretations seen thus far, viz. the whole range from "inside you" to "within your power" to "in your midst" is philologically possible.

As an improper preposition taking the genitive, ἐντός occurs nine times in the LXX (Jb 18, 20; Pss 38 (39), 4; 102 (103), 1; 108 (109), 22; Ct 3, 10; Sir 19, 26; Is 16, 11; Dn 10, 16; 1Mc 4, 48).[34] In every instance the correct idiomatic rendering can only be "within," "inside of," or an equivalent. In each passage, however, the object of the preposition is singular in number and usually a person's interior (exception: 1Mc where the reference is to

---

[34] E. Hatch and H. Redpath, A Concordance to the LXX I (Oxford, 1897), 480.

the interior of a temple), e.g. Ps 102 (103), 1: πάντα τὰ ἐντὸς μου ; Ps 108 (109), 22: ἡ καρδία μου τεταραγται ἐντὸς μου .[35]

Aquila, whose version includes four instances of ἐντός (Ex 17, 7; 34, 9; Jb 2, 8; Ez 28, 16),[36] employs the preposition with a first person plural pronoun in Ex 17, 7 and 34, 9. These passages, in the context of which the object is a plural pronoun of separate parts, more than likely demand (contra Allen[37]) the meaning "in our midst" rather than "within us" in the sense of "within our hearts," for in Ex 17, 7 it is a question of how the Lord is providentially with the Israelites and in 34, 9 it is a question of the Lord's being besought to accompany them.[38]

---

[35]E. Rahlfs (ed.), Septuaginta (Stuttgart, 1950), pp. 110 - 122.

[36]Hatch - Redpath, op. cit., p. 480.

[37]P. Allen, "The Meaning of ἐντός , "ExpT 49 (1937), 476f; "Luke 17, 21," ibid. 50 (1938), 233 - 235.

[38]The most recent appeal to Aquila's version of Ex 17, 7 as an argument for "in the midst of" in Lk 17, 21b is to be found in A. Strobel, "In dieser Nacht," ZTKir 58 (1961), 28f. According to F. Field's Hexapla Origenis I (Oxford, 1875), 111, the text and versions here under discussion are as follows:

Hebrew	בְּקִרְבֵּנוּ
LXX and Σ	ἐν ἡμῖν
A	ἐντὸς ἡμῶν
Θ	ἐν μέσῳ ἡμῶν (incorrectly cited for Symmachus by Strobel, loc. cit., p. 29)

The fact is that the Hebrew בְּקִרְבֵּנוּ is of itself ambiguous (cf. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus [London, 1954], p. 303 who reports a rabbinic dispute on the meaning of the phrase in Ex 17, 7). While this writer unhesitatingly favors the meaning of "in our midst" for Hebrew Ex 17, 7 and hence affirms the probability of the same meaning for Aquila's ἐντὸς ἡμῶν, he also admits the possibility that Aquila could have understood "within us," since that version is literally possible for the Hebrew.

The same remarks apply to Ex 34, 9 (Field, op. cit., p. 144):

Hebrew	בְּקִרְבֵּנוּ
LXX	μεθ' ἡμῶν
A	ἐντὸς ἡμῶν
Θ	ἐν μέσῳ ἡμῶν

Yet in both cases the context and especially the fact that an immanent deity better fits Greek philosophy than Hebrew theology give weight to the argument that Aquila too has meant "in our midst."

Strobel (loc. cit., p. 29) also appeals to Aquila's version of Jb 2, 8 (Field, op. cit. II, 7):

Hebrew	בְּתוֹךְ־הָאֵפֶר
LXX	ἐπὶ τῆς σποδοῦ
A	ἐντὸς τῆς σποδοῦ
Σ	ἐπὶ σποδοῦ

Here the Hebrew is unambiguous; the phrase means "in the midst of" or "among" the ashes. Strobel has failed to notice, however, that Jb 2, 8 is not really parallel to Lk 17, 21b because the object of the preposition in Jb is not a plural of separate parts.

The preposition ἐντός is found in the version of Symmachus sixteen times.[39] In three instances the object is a plural group of separate parts:[40]

Lam 1, 3 ἐντὸς τῶν θλιβόντων αὐτήν

Ps 87 (88), 5 ἐντὸς νεκρῶν ἀφεθεὶς ἐλεύθερος

Ps 140 (141), 5 ἐντὸς τῶν κακιῶν αὐτῶν

The sense of the phrase here can only be "in the midst of" or its equivalent or perhaps "under the control of" (cf. Roberts below), but not "within" in the sense of "within the heart."

Theodotian uses ἐντός only once[41] (Dn 10, 16), and the object is a first singular pronoun, so that the phrase means "within me."

As in biblical Greek, so, too, in classical, it is easily shown that ἐντός usually (at least with a singular object) means "within" in the sense of "within the heart." What is to be noted is the fact that it can also mean "in the midst of" with a plural object of separate parts. Thus,

---

[39] Hatch - Redpath, op. cit., p.480.

[40] F. Field, Hexapla Origenis II (Oxford, 1875), in loc.

[41] Hatch - Redpath, op. cit., p. 480.

Xen. Hell. II, 3, 19 ἐντὸς τουτῶν speaking of the possibility of evil men within their number, i.e. "in their midst."

Anab. I, 10, 3 ἐντὸς αυτῶν where a rescued harlot is put, i.e. "within their lines," i.e. "in their midst."

Thucy. VIII, 5, 3 ἐντὸς αὐτῶν where camp followers are put, i.e. "within the group," i.e. "in their midst."[42]

It is not implied here, however, that the preposition with a plural object of separate parts must always mean "in the midst of"; the impossibility of such a conclusion is evident if one contrasts, for example, Plato (Laws 789A) where ἐντὸς τῶν αὐτῶν μητέρων is specifically defined in the context of unborn children still in their mothers' wombs. The point is that the context, and not the preposition, must be the point of departure.

From twenty examples of ἐντός, E. Mayser, in his grammar of the Ptolemaic papyri,[43] draws three distinct meanings: (1) "within" in a local sense; (2) "within in

---

[42]The references to classical Greek are taken from A. Sledd, "The Interpretation of Lk 17, 21," ExpT 50 (1938), 235f.

[43]E. Mayser, Grammatik der griechischen Papyri (Leipzig, 1923), p. 539.

a temporal sense; (3) a development of these uses: "within" the limits of, up to (e.g. up to a certain sum of money). In general therefore the function of the preposition is to include or limit, implying the existence of something outside, with which its object is contrasted, e.g. "within your circle" implying the existence of "outside your circle."

C. H. Roberts has adduced evidence from the Roman papyri to show that ἐντός need not mean "within" even with a singular object.[44] He cites P. Russ. Georg. 3, 1 (Zeretelli - Jernstedt, Papyri Russischer und Georgischer Sammlungen III [Tiflis, 1930], p. 6) which is part of a letter written in 270 a.d. by a young Greek doctor attached to Roman forces near Alexandria. The letter includes a request for a woolen jacket:

πεμψατέ μοι τὸ ἐραιοῦν κολώβειν (l. ἐρεοῦν κολόβιον) ἵνα ἐντὸς μοῦ αὐ[το] εὕρω.

Next Roberts cites an unpublished papyrus from Oxyrhynchus addressed to C. Minicius Italus, Prefect of Egypt (99 - 100 a.d.) from a wine merchant claiming fraud on the part of his late partner's widow:

ἡ δὲ ἔχουσ[α] τὸ φόρτιον το[ῦ] οἴνου ἐντὸς αὐτῆς τὴν τιμὴν ἐνεβόλευσε πᾶσαν.

---

[44] C. H. Roberts, "The Kingdom of Heaven (Lk XVII. 21)," HarvTR 41 (1948), 1 - 8.

Finally there is P. Oxy. 10, 1274:

ἔτι ὄντος ἐντὸς τοῦ λαιτωρίου νομοῦ

Evidently the preposition under consideration could be translated in all three examples by an equivalent of "in the hands of" or "under the control of." H. J. Cadbury[45] (with Lk 17, 21b in mind) prefers "within the possession or reach of."[46]

On the basis of all the foregoing examples of the use of ἐντός a summary is now possible. The conclusions which follow are a slightly revised form of those reached by A. Sledd[47] whose study was too early to include the work of Roberts, Rüstow, and Strobel.

---

[45] H. J. Cadbury, "Lk 17, 21," Christian Century 67 (1950), 172.

[46] A. Rüstow ("ΕΝΤΟΣ ΥΜΩΝ ΕΣΤΙΝ: zur Deutung von Lc 17, 21 - 21," ZNW 51 [1960], 213 - 215) cites at least a dozen passages from the classical and papyri Greek to support this meaning (among his examples is Anab. 1, 10, 31). H. Riesenfeld, ("ΕΜΒΑΛΕΥΕΙΝ-ΕΝΤΟΣ," Nuntius Sodalicii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis 2 [1949], 11f), and A. Wikgren, ("ΕΝΤΟΣ," ibid. 4 [1950], 27f) have questioned Roberts's conclusions, pointing out that each of his examples can be explained on the basis of an analogy with ἐν Ἅιδου which stands elliptically for ἐντὸς τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ, i.e. "in the house of" or "in the dwelling of." Applied to Lk 17, 21b, the meaning there would be "in your domain" which is about the same as "in your midst." J. G. Griffiths ("ἐντὸς ὑμῶν [Lk 17, 21]," ExpT 63 [1951], 30) also questions Roberts's conclusions and holds to a local meaning of "on this side of." Although these objections to Roberts's conclusions make his interpretation less certain, they do not, in the opinion of this writer, prove them to be unwarranted.

[47] A. Sledd, loc. cit., p. 237.

Conclusions

(1) A stereotyped rendering of "within" for ἐντός is not adequate to represent all shades of the word.

(2) The word indicates a general relation of "within" as opposed to "without" certain limits without implying anything with reference to the nature of those limits or the site of the inwardness. This site and sort of inwardness is determined by the dependent genitive and the context, not by the preposition alone.

(3) The sense of "within the heart," most common when the dependent genitive is in the singular number, cannot be asserted apodictically. When the dependent genitive is in the plural number, it need not mean, and sometimes cannot mean, inside any member or members.

Hence the phrase ἐντὸς ὑμῶν in Lk 17, 21b may mean "within you" or "within your power" or "in your midst." The choice of a rendering must depend upon more than purely philological considerations, for any one of the three different meanings just cited is philologically defensible.

CHAPTER IV

A FORM-CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF LK 17, 20f: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

The preceding chapters have demonstrated that both the history of the interpretation and the philological analysis of Lk 17, 20f emphasize the problems surrounding any effort to interpret the pericope with complete confidence. Moreover the investigation to this point has scored another positive gain: it has provided definite limits for additional inquiry. It is the aim of the present chapter to pursue the inquiry by calling upon the resources of form criticism for light in determining the genre littéraire of Lk 17, 20f. Such a determination it is hoped will aid immensely in giving further precision to the character and content of the pericope and, indeed, will suggest possibilities regarding the very origin of the passage and the influences that preserved it for inclusion in the form and place that it now occupies in the canonical third gospel.

The application of form criticism, however, demands a certain number of preliminary considerations. More than half a century of application to the Bible excludes for form-critical

methodology the adjective "new." The truth is, however, that more than one circumstance indicates the inadvisability of proceeding with an analysis of this kind without first outlining explicitly and in some detail the fundamental presuppositions upon which such an investigation is based.[1] Accordingly, in the interest of absolute clarity and despite the certainty that what follows is hardly anything more than what is already well known and generally accepted in most schools of NT criticism, an exposition of the basic assumptions underlying the present effort would seem to be justified.[2]

---

[1]From a purely scientific point of view a statement of procedural presuppositions eliminates possible confusion; for in point of fact, the history of form criticism reveals wide divergences both in terminology and conception of form and content, not to mention the frequently mutually exclusive theological, philosophical, and sociological postulates of the discipline's adherents. Cf., in addition to the studies listed in note two below, V. Taylor, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition (London, 1935, reprinted 1960), pp. 1 - 21; F. McCool, "The Preacher and the Historical Witness of the Gospels," TS 21 (1960), 517 - 543; on the important distinction between the form-critical method and a particular philosophy cf. esp. O. Cullmann, "Out of Season Remarks on the 'Historical Jesus' of the Bultmann School," tr. J. Martyn, Union Seminary Quarterly Review 16 (1961), 131 - 148.

Secondly, the continuing publication of articles expressing chagrin at what are purported to be exegetical trends among an anonymous set of scholars (cf. most recently F. L. Filas, "A Quandry About the Bible," The Priest 16 [1960], 1063 - 1069; G. Kennedy, "Scripture Revisited: or a Second Look at the Matter," AER 145 [1961], 1 - 14) at least emphasizes the propriety on the part of identifiable exegetes of risking repetitious standard observations so as to avoid furnishing matter for further egregious misunderstandings.

[2]The literature explaining and evaluating form criticism as well as the historical vagaries of the method is immense.

First of all, with reference to the gospels in general, few contemporary scholars would find serious fault with the conclusion of H. Riesenfeld that

> In the history of religion and literature alike a gospel is something wholly unique. It is true that there are distant parallels in the biographies of philosophers or rulers in the Greek literature of the hellenistic age. This is more particularly so in the case of St. Luke's

---

Limiting himself to NT criticism, the present writer readily acknowledges a special debt to V. Taylor, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition (London, 1960); X. Léon-Dufour, "Aux Sources des Évangiles," Introduction à la Bible II (Tournai, 1959), 296-320 (which recapitulates conclusions in J. Huby - X. Léon Dufour, L'Évangile et les Évangiles [Paris, 1954], pp. 10 - 93; and "Formgeschichte et Redaktionsgeschichte des Évangiles synoptiques," RSR 45 [1958], 237 - 269); A Wikenhauser, New Testament Introduction, tr. J. Cunningham (New York, 1958), pp. 253 - 276. Besides valuable studies on the concrete application of form criticism, too numerous to detail here (but, e.g., R. Dillon, "St. Luke's Infancy Account," The Dunwoodie Review 1 [1961], 5 - 37), the present writer also acknowledges the help afforded by the many salutary observations in such works as those by P. Benoit, "Reflexions sur la 'Formgeschichtliche Methode,'" RB 53 (1946), 481 - 512; H. Riesenfeld, "The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings," The Gospels Reconsidered (Oxford, 1960), pp. 131 - 153; and V. O'Keefe, "Towards Understanding the Gospels," CBQ 21 (1959), 171 - 189.

Apart from the scientific obligation to employ all available resources so as better to understand the word of God, no Catholic exegete can in conscience afford to ignore the directives issued nearly twenty years ago by the late Pius XII. Quite specifically:

> Quapropter catholicus exegeta, ut hodiernis rei biblicae necessitatibus rite satisfaciat, in exponenda Scriptura Sacra, in eademque ab omni errore immuni ostendenda et comprobanda, eo quoque prudenter subsidio utatur, ut perquirat quid dicendi forma seu litterarum genus, ab hagiographo adhibitum, ad veram et genuinam conferat interpretationem; ac sibi persuadeat hanc officii sui partem sine magno catholicae exegeseos detrimento neglegi non posse. (Ency. "Divino Afflante Spiritu," AAS 35 [1943], 316)

> gospel, the only one of the four which has been in any degree moulded by literary considerations. On the other hand, there exist certain parallels on Palestinian soil, notably in the prophetic books of the Old Testament. Here we have parallels in matters of outward form, to the preaching of Jesus and to his appearances before his hearers as these are portrayed in the gospels. But none of these parallels takes us beyond individual items. To the gospel as a whole there is no known parallel or analogy.[3]

New Testament form criticism, which derives its name from the "forms" or patterns in which the gospel material is presented, has as its material object, so to speak, not so much the larger unique form known as the gospel, as the subordinated literary units that combine to make up the gospel. The form critic seeks conclusions from the forms themselves with regard to the character of various parts of the gospel tradition in the oral stage which lies behind the written gospels.

Relying especially on the data from source criticism, the following postulates can be formulated as the bases of the form-critical method employed in this study:

---

[3] Ibid., p. 131. What is true of the whole is also to a large extent true of the parts. The absurdities resulting from attempts to identify the gospels or their parts either with modern scientific biographies or with ancient pagan myth-forms are well known. For a particularly illuminating illustration of the principle that "Analogie ist nicht Genealogie," cf. L. J. McGinley, Form Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives (Woodstock, 1944).

(1) The synoptic gospels are compilations.[4] In them traditional material and redaction may be sharply distinguished. Only the individual sayings of Jesus and the individual stories are traditional.[5] They must be separated from the framework in

---

[4]Cf. Wikenhauser, op. cit., p. 273: "This does not mean that the evangelists can be considered as mere collectors who have juxtaposed the sayings and deeds of Jesus quite superficially and have joined them with meaningless connecting phrases. The outline of the life of Jesus which Mk presents certainly must be considered historical in substance." Illustrative of the compilation character of the gospels are Mt's groupings and the gathering of most of the non-Markan material into Lk's so-called travel narrative. Other evidences of artificial grouping will be cited from time to time in the course of this chapter (cf. e.g. n. 5 below). A constant balance of perspective is necessary. Accordingly, it is worthwhile to cite Wikenhauser's further observation that " . . . the entire tradition does not disintegrate into isolated pieces with no inner connection. On the contrary, in all these individual sayings and stories the speaker and actor is he in whom, according to the belief of the primitive Christians, the time of salvation began. They all deal with the great theme of the NT: In Jesus of Nazareth the Messia has appeared on earth. And so the traditional passages which seem separated are joined by a strong bond of inner unity." (p. 274). It may be further remarked that an analysis of the compilation character of the synoptic gospels shows simultaneously the extraordinary skill of the inspired redactors and their instinctive respect for their sources.

[5]So Wikenhauser, op. cit., p. 271; Léon-Dufour ("Aux Sources . . . " op. cit., p. 310) holds that the summaries can have preexisted the redaction of the gospel. What is to be said of transitions? The answer will depend upon the literary unit in question. For example, in a collection of episodes grouped according to content and arranged in the order of climax (e.g. Mk 2, 1 - 3, 6) the transitions appear to be purely redactional.

which they are embedded and must be treated by themselves, for, as Wikenhauser notes, "only in this way can the original proper significance of a saying or narrative be established."[6]

(2) During the oral period the gospel tradition, stemming ultimately from "eyewitnesses and ministers of the word" (Lk 1, 2), circulated mainly in separate oral units subject to

---

[6] Ibid. It cannot be insisted upon too strongly that the postulate that the gospels are compilations arises from the evidence of the gospels themselves. This basis therefore is not aprioristic. In addition to the evidence from larger units alluded to thus far, it is possible to become very much more detailed. Cf. e.g. Wikenhauser, op. cit., pp. 272, 273:

> Even if the pericopae are joined by commonly accepted expressions of time, the order in which they stand is not necessarily the chronological order of the incidents recounted in them. The clearest evidence of this is the fact that a number of pericopae have different settings in the individual gospels; thus e.g. the healing of the leper (Mk 1, 40 - 45) appears elsewhere in Mt (8, 1 - 4) and Lk (5, 12 - 16).
>
> The transition from one pericope to another is generally very indefinite ('and,' 'when,' 'then,' 'immediately,' 'in those days,' 'at that time'). . . . they are generally to be understood simply as transition formulae.
>
> . . . this applies . . . even more to the sayings of Our Lord; it may be asserted that all the long discourses of Our Lord in the Synoptics . . . are groupings of single sayings according to subject matter.
>
> Topographical information, when it is given at all, is often as vague as the chronology: 'on the way,' 'in a house,' 'on the sea,' 'on the mountain,' 'in one of the cities.' Although Jesus performed many works in Chorozain (Mt 11, 21; Lk 10, 13), the NT does not locate a single one there. Only a comparatively small number of the pericopae tell where the incident happened . . .

the influence of the contemporary demands of Christian life.[7] Hence with the synoptic gospels as the indispensable point of departure, it is frequently possible to detect, isolate, and classify these original units of tradition and to gain thereby valuable insights both into the significance of the later formulations as they now exist in the written gospels and into the very life of the first Christian communities; for it is within the context of the primitive Christian community that are to be sought the forces which recalled and kept alive the individual units of the gospel tradition and shaped them with the emphasis required to meet the needs of the Church.

---

[7] Cf. Taylor, op. cit., pp. 22 - 43. Although it is quite correct to say that the gospels are expressions of faith, it must be borne in mind that the basis of that faith is a fact: the historical Jesus whose words and deeds account for the origins of the gospel tradition. That the primitive Christian community was intensely interested in the words and deeds of the historical Jesus has been demonstrated repeatedly (cf. e.g. the studies listed below). Accordingly, the sociological theory of the Bultmann school, viz. that the primitive community created the gospel tradition, cannot be sustained. Indeed, in the last analysis, Bultmann's sociological principles derive, not from form criticism but from existentialist philosophy (cf. e.g. O. Cullmann, loc. cit.). Again, many researches on the whole question of history and sociology behind the gospels are available; cf. e.g. J. Baruzi, Problèmes d'histoire des Religions: Le problem de la forme et l'exégèse contemporaine (Paris, 1935), pp. 108ff; more recently: F. Mussner "Der historische Jesus und der Christus des Glaubens," BZ 1 (1957), 224 - 252; B. Rigaux, "L'historicite de Jésus devant l'exégèse recent," RB 65 (1958), 481 - 522; A. M. Ramsey, "The Gospel and the Gospels," The Gospels Reconsidered (Oxford, 1960), pp. 99 - 106.

Granting the support of these two postulates, the steps to be taken in a form-critical analysis may be briefly outlined:

(1) The individual units within the gospel compilations must be detected, isolated, and classified into descriptive categories of literary forms.[8]

(2) After classification, it is possible to attempt the recovery of the original form of the material during the oral period and, in some instances, to trace the subsequent changes it has undergone.[9]

---

[8]Cf. Taylor, op. cit., p. 22. It is perhaps well to add here that Taylor, like all form critics, points out that, for purposes of classification, it does not matter whether a narrative or a saying comes from Mk, Q, or any other source which critics have posited, since the object of the study is the primitive tradition before it was committed to writing. As Wikenhauser has observed, " . . . form criticism delivers us from the false idea of 'degrees of reliability,' i.e. that the historical reliability of the synoptic material varies according to the written source from which it has been drawn, e.g. that the content of the two oldest sources, Mk and Q, is more dependable than parts peculiar to Mt and Lk respectively. . . . Since all the pieces of the synoptic gospels derive from oral tradition, each must be treated according to the category to which it belongs." (op. cit., p. 275) That this first step is a difficult and at times an impossible task is obvious from the diverse arrangements and nomenclature proposed by the various exponents of form criticism. The present undertaking is simplified by the more modest objective of determining only one form, that of Lk 17, 20f, a form which, in the opinion of the present writer, is easily recognized and frequently attested in all of the synoptic gospels.

[9]Cf. Taylor, op. cit., p. 26. The justification for this step, according to Taylor, is to be claimed on several grounds: "In the first place, the Acts, the Pauline epistles, and the epistle of James supply material for inferences regarding the

(3) Finally, the form critic is to seek for the life-situations that account for the preservation and formation of the particular unit of gospel tradition under consideration.[10] It is at this stage of the analysis that special recognition is accorded the role of the living Church in the formation of the gospel tradition.[11]

---

conditions of the primitive period. We catch glimpses of the first Christian assemblies (1 Cor 11, 18ff; Jas 2, 1ff) and hear echoes of the early preaching (Acts 3, 11ff; 1 Cor 15, 1ff). Again, the modifications which the later Synoptists make in their sources furnish grounds for inferring the kind of changes for which we must make allowance in Mk and Q. 'Laws of the tradition' can be suspected, even if they cannot be laid down as hard and fast rules, and further evidence of changes is supplied by the textual tradition and the Apocryphal Gospels. Thirdly, Rabbinical tradition is available, and evidence can be obtained from the popular stories and sayings preserved in Greek literature and in the songs and folk tales of all lands. The Synoptic material can be compared with parallel matter, and inferences, however perilous they may sometimes be, are made possible. In these ways it is often possible to work back to a form which preceded that now found in the Gospels and which for various reasons has been modified by the Evangelists." (pp. 26, 27). The fewer the parallels, of course, the less sure this step may be. In the case of Lk 17, 20f the absence of exact parallels in Mk and Mt makes this step much more speculative, but this drawback is at least partially offset by the fact that the form itself of Lk 17, 20f is quite primitive, as will be shown.

[10] As Taylor himself emphasizes (op. cit., p. 36ff), a danger to be avoided is that of limiting the life-situation unduly by pressing too strongly any one of the controlling factors.

[11] Cf. Taylor, op. cit., p. 1. To avoid all misconceptions: by "gospel tradition" is meant "that which we have received from the first Christians concerning the words and deeds of Jesus"; by "formation" is meant "both the external characteristics of the tradition and the process by which it came into being." Again, the ultimate reduction is to the

What were the "life-situations," or the Sitze im Leben ecclesiae as they are sometimes called, that shaped the gospel tradition? Lk reflects the general context of an answer in Acts 1, 8 " . . . you will be witnesses for me in Jerusalem and all over Judea and Samaria and to the very ends of the earth." Here is one formulation of a charge, the response to which was realized in the conscious assumption of a continuous twofold concern, a double obligation that underlies the Sitze im Leben ecclesiae: the obligation to proclaim the gospel to the Jews and Gentiles and the obligation to live the gospel within the Church. It is in the light of these obligations that three milieux may be distinguished.[12]

(1) The liturgical milieu: cf. Acts 2, 42ff "the breaking of the bread." The account of the Last Supper and the story of Jesus's suffering and death would have to be related on these occasions to keep alive the meaning of the liturgical action, the living remembrance of Jesus and the link of the disciples with their Master, with the Lord whom

---

"eyewitnesses and ministers of the word" (cf. the provocative study of H. Riesenfeld cited in n. 2 above). Léon-Dufour puts the matter well, "Former, c'est donner une forme à un matériau préexistant; il y a sans doute création littéraire, mais elle est faite habituellement à partir d'un événement ou d'une sentence rapportés par un témoin." ("Aux sources . . . " op. cit., p. 310).

[12] The descriptive divisions that follow are those of Léon-Dufour, "Aux sources . . . " op. cit., pp. 312 - 315; cf. also L'Évangile et les Evangiles, pp. 10 - 30.

they knew in his lifetime and who continues to live in their midst.[13]

(2) The catechetical milieu: converts required fuller instruction for the nourishment and development of their faith (cf. e.g. Acts 8). Many of the sayings and deeds of Jesus would have been recalled and then handed on precisely with a view to encouraging neophytes and providing for them the lines of conduct demanded by their new mode of life.

(3) The missionary milieu: prospective converts had to be approached in terms that they could appreciate. Within this context the kerygmatic presentation of the Good News was paramount (cf. Acts 2, 14ff). It would take as a starting-point an understanding of the prophecies. Thus light would be thrown on Jesus's actions, his miracles, controversies, his manner of humbly preaching as the Servant of Yahweh.

In summary, then, it is possible to see that the liturgical, catechetical, and missionary milieux are the major contexts within which the sayings and deeds of Jesus were recalled and expressed in oral units gradually shaped by the daily

---

[13] Another example is that of the Emmaus account (Lk 24, 13ff) which surely reflects, among other things, a liturgico-doctrinal instruction regarding the Eucharist: the Scriptures lead to Christ, but he (the risen Christ) is most intimately encountered in the "breaking of the bread," i.e. in the Eucharist. Cf. C. Vollert, "The Eucharist: Quests for Insights from Scripture," TS 21 (1960), 404 - 443, and the studies there cited.

experience of the Church until they came to be fixed in writing.[14]

Léon-Dufour[15] rightly insists upon the importance of allowing for a multiple life situation that influenced the gospel tradition. The reason is not simply that the events of the life of Christ can have several meanings, but also that the same believers could have recalled the same facts on different occasions to meet different needs. Thus they would have been able to orient the tradition toward various forms up to the time that the individual units or crystallized blocks of tradition found their way into the framework of the synoptic gospels.[16]

---

[14] As mentioned above (n. 10), the plurality of perspectives is essential if the form critic is to avoid oversimplification and arbitrariness. This writer has in mind such critics as M. Dibelius (Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, ed. G. Bornkamm [3rd ed. Tübingen, 1959], pp. 8ff; 30ff) who attempts to explain everything in terms of the needs of primitive preachers and their sermons. In contrast, Léon-Dufour offers the example of the account of the multiplication of loaves ("Aux sources . . . " op. cit., p. 313) where it is possible to discern not only a liturgical perspective, but also an ecclesiastical one (the institution of the community of disciples) and a missionary one (the presence of Jesus among the pagans).

[15] "Aux sources . . . " op. cit., p. 313.

[16] Cf. e.g. the accounts of the Call of the Disciples (Mt 4, 18 - 20; Lk 5, 1 - 11). In Mt the literary form is that of a "pronouncement-story," i.e. a short narrative culminating in a saying of Jesus, the "pronouncement" or saying being the point of emphasis. Hence in Mt the whole point of the unit is the saying, "I will make you fishers of men."

There remains the specification of possible motives that would have induced the selection of individual sayings and narratives of Jesus as apt guides within the various Sitze im Leben ecclesiae. Once again it is Leon-Dufour in particular who has performed a valuable service for form criticism by proposing the following division:[17]

(1) Some incidents were recalled to help solve problems evoked by the demands of everyday Christian life. Was the Sabbath abolished? Were Pharisaic fasts to be observed? What was the attitude to be taken toward non-Jews? toward sinners? Should infants be baptized? What was the position of the Mosaic Law, especially the laws of ritual purification? What of divorce? of the temple tax? When would the reign of God come? What about death that struck unexpectedly? What of the fourth commandment when it seemed to conflict with the missionary vocation?

(2) There was also the apologetic motive. Miracles would have been recalled and carefully selected to point up

---

In Lk, on the other hand, the same incident has received the form of a miracle-story or story about Jesus. Surely, different concrete circumstances in the life of the early Church account for the different orientations given the same tradition. Accordingly, to ask which account is "more historical" is to miss the point completely, the point being that in one set of circumstances it was, for any number of reasons, important to emphasize the saying while in another set of circumstances it was the event that required emphasis.

[17] "Aux Sources . . . " op. cit., pp. 313, 314.

the messianic character of Jesus. Christians would have looked to Jesus's controversies with Jews for help in their own debates with the same opponents.

(3) The historical motive was all important. While the early Christians may not have expected many centuries of existence for the Church, and while they might have fervently hoped for the Parousia in the near future, they were nevertheless vitally interested in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ from an historical point of view. Like Judaism, primitive Christianity was a religion based on objective fact; it was an historical religion. If Christ did not live, work miracles, preach, suffer, die, and rise, then there was simply no Christian religion.

Indeed, interest in Jesus's earthly life as such appears to be the most satisfactory explanation for the preservation of some of the materials selected. A startling example of the historical motive at work may be found in the embarrassing reply that Jesus gave when asked about the time of his second coming, "But of that day or that hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father" (Mk 13, 32). Most scholars would hold that such an admission of ignorance would be the sort of thing to be suppressed, were it not for its undeniable historical character. The same might be said of the accounts of the attitude of Jesus's relatives,

the bloody sweat, etc.

Hence any form critic who denies absolutely the possibility of the historical motive in the recollection and selection of the sayings and deeds that make up the gospel tradition is placed in a rather awkward position, for he will also have to deny the influence of "eyewitnesses and ministers of the word" upon the formation of the primitive tradition. And it is in connection with the latter that the incisive and constructive argument of V. Taylor (op. cit., pp. 41, 42) has come to be cited frequently in Catholic works:

> As Bultmann sees it, the primitive community exists in vacuo, cut off from its founders by the walls of inexplicable ignorance. Like Robinson Crusoe, it must do the best it can. Unable to turn to anyone for information, it must invent situations for the words of Jesus and put into his lips sayings which personal memory cannot check. All this is absurd . . . However disturbing to the smooth working of theories, the influence of eyewitnesses on the formation of the tradition cannot possibly be ignored. The one hundred and twenty at Pentecost did not go into permanent retreat; for at least a generation they moved among the young Palestinian communities, and through preaching and fellowship their recollections were at the disposal of those who sought information [italics this writer's]. Unfortunately, as the material in the Gospel shows, the first Christians did not possess the biographical interests which mark the modern man; they neither put, nor thought of putting questions we should deem of first importance. Moreover, we have to allow for the gradual disappearance by death of the first witnesses and for the prevailing interest in the speedy Return of Christ. But when all qualifications have been made, the presence of personal testimony is an element in the formative process which it is folly to ignore. By its neglect

> of this factor, Form Criticism gains in internal coherence, but it loses its power to accomplish its main task which is to describe the Sitz im Leben of the tradition.

On the other hand, the distinction between form criticism and historical criticism must be maintained if utter confusion of the respective methodologies is not to result. This therefore is perhaps the place to insist with Wikenhauser (op. cit., p. 275) upon that distinction. The anti-historical bias of Bultmann, as mentioned earlier, derives not from the application of form-critical methods but from his personal philosophical and sociological theories. Neither does the form-critical method qua method seek to prove the historicity of such and such a saying or deed recorded in the gospels. Its function, as has been explained, is rather to isolate and classify literary forms in the hope of reaching by further analysis and comparison a reliable picture of the forces that led to the recollection, selection, preservation, and formation of the gospel tradition which eventually became fixed in writing. The first result of the method is a clearer understanding of the gospels as we have them and a better portrait of the primitive church.

It is only after the successful application of the form-critical method that its data is seen to be of immense value for historical criticism. Historical criticism has, so to

speak, a distinctive formal object; form-critical data may be considered one of the resources of historical criticism, for despite the wide variation of literary forms and their divergent histories and purposes, there emerges a clear and consistent testimony to the historical Jesus. The unity of impression regarding the person of Jesus attested by the multiplicity of forms can find a satisfactory explanation only on the assumption that he did so exist and teach and work. Hence the lie is given to the arbitrary distinction between the Christ of history and the Christ of faith which was so long in vogue.

It is a wonder then that contemporary Catholic apologetics has all but ignored the valuable auxiliary of form-critical data. For more than two decades the apologist has had at his disposal the positive findings of scholars such as C. H. Dodd, "The Gospels as History," BJRylL 22 (1938), 137ff; History and the Gospels (London, 1938); more recently cf. esp. B. Rigaux, loc. cit., pp. 481 - 522. A sample of Dodd's work will illustrate the point (cf. loc. cit., pp. 137 - 139; op. cit., pp. 99ff):

If the following pericopes are considered, viz. (1) The Call of Levi Mk 2, 14; (2) The Feast with Publicans and Sinners Mk 2, 15 - 17; (3) Zacchaeus Lk 19, 1 - 10; (4) The sinful woman in Simon's house Lk 7, 36 - 48;

(5) The parable of the lost sheep Lk 15, 1 - 7; Mt 18, 12, 13; (6) The parable of the Pharisee and the Publican Lk 18, 10 - 14; (7) The parable of the children in the market-place Mt 11, 16 - 19; Lk 7, 31 - 35 i.e. Q; (8) The saying, "The publicans and harlots enter the kingdom of God before you" Mt 21, 31, a unity emerges.

The above selections include a variety of traditional literary forms: aphorisms, parables, poetical sayings, dialogues, stories of various kinds -- taken from all four main strata of the synoptic gospels: Mk, Q, M, and L. The underlying motifs vary: number four teaches forgiveness; number six is an instruction on prayer; numbers seven and eight comment on the actual situation in Jesus's ministry (number seven in poetical and parabolic form; number eight as an aphorism). But all of them exhibit Jesus as an historical personality distinguished from all other religious personalities of his time by his friendly attitude toward the outcasts of society. This converging testimony is impressive and lends greater historical weight to this central theme than any one of the individual stories taken by itself.

Dodd employs the same method with similar data from form criticism to demonstrate that during his ministry Jesus was a voluntary exile from home and family, that he continuously triumphed over the powers of evil, that he emphasized a

contrast between the old and new dispensations, that he taught that the time of fulfillment was at hand and that the rejection of Jesus by the Jews is a sign of divine judgment. And this is only the barest summary of a few themes.

That so many sayings, parables, stories, and the like from the various sources converge on such themes (and there is every reason to believe that many more themes might be so elucidated) is excellent witness to the primitive character of these themes. They must have been part of the accepted and established tradition before it branched out into the independent channels which terminated in the sources upon which the evangelists drew. And since the individual passages converge on these central themes which must come from the central tradition, it is only reasonable to suppose that they also go back to the primitive tradition as individual and self-contained units. Accordingly, so far as historical criticism is concerned, this unity in multiplicity provides an impregnable argument for the historical basis of all the convergent themes.

CHAPTER V

THE ORIGIN AND MEANING OF LK 17, 20f

The bases and procedures of form criticism having been specified, it is now possible to approach directly the form-critical analysis of Lk 17, 20f. If the analysis itself is at all successful, the data obtained thereby should, in combination with the results from philology, afford approximately precise answers to the following queries:

(1) What is the Sitz im Leben Jesu[1] of Lk 17, 20f, i.e. what concrete historical circumstances in the life of Christ account for this unit of gospel tradition?

---

[1]The terminology of NT Form-Criticism is not standardized. Hence, the present writer has felt it imperative that his terms be clearly defined. The terms and the definitions here employed are based on the usage of E. F. Siegman, "Teaching in Parables," CBQ 23 (1961), 161 - 181. So far as this writer can ascertain, it is D. Stanley ("Balaam's Ass, or a Problem in New Testament Hermeneutics," CBQ 20 [1958], 50) who first employs the phrase Sitz im Evangelium. The phrase Sitz im Leben, meaning the life-situation from which ancient tales sprang, dates back to the usage of H. Gunkel at least (cf. V. Taylor, op. cit., p. 11). The distinction between Sitz im Leben Ecclesiae and Sitz im Leben Jesu must be maintained if there is to be avoided the errors of those pioneer form-critics who spoke only of a Sitz im Leben to account not only for the preservation of Jesus's sayings but also for their very origin as well.

(2) What are the Sitze im Leben Ecclesiae of Lk 17, 20f, i.e. what situations or needs within the primitive Christian community account for the formation and preservation of the pericope?

(3) What is the Sitz im Evangelium of Lk 17, 20f, i.e., what is the function of the passage as it now stands in Lk's gospel?

Lk 17, 20f Occurs in the Travel Narrative

It will be recalled that the interpolated[2] section (9, 51 - 18, 14) of Lk's Travel Narrative (9, 51 - 19, 27)

---

[2]That is, the evangelist has inserted this extensive compilation into Mk's outline of the public ministry (between Mk 9, 50 and 10, 1). Less than 15 verses in this section are found in Mk, while more than half of the matter is peculiar to Lk (L), the remainder belonging to Mt - Lk (Q). This source-critical data is helpful in informing the reader of Lk's intent to construct a largely superficial framework, for, as B. Reicke has observed ("Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative," The Gospels Reconsidered Oxford, 1960 , p. 109): " . . . if the many Q passages contained in the Travel Narrative are compared with the corresponding passages in Mt, it is evident that none of them in Mt refers to the Lord's going up to Jerusalem. This fact makes it probable that it was Lk, or a predecessor of his, who incorporated these Q traditions into the Travel Narrative. . . . the same would be the case with the traditions . . . peculiar to Lk, since they also have no individual relation to the Jerusalem journey. . . . Lk, wishing to fill up the gap between the Galilean and Judean periods, simply used material available partly through the source called Q and partly through peculiar traditions and then gave this material a superficial relation to the biographical framework by inserting a few remarks on the Lord's going up to Jerusalem. . . . 1) the gap existing in the earlier gospel stories was filled; 2) it was possible to do this with material which Lk found valuable and instructive and did not want to omit [or distribute: cf. Mt's Q material] and which it was quite convenient to insert here."

is the part of the third gospel within which the pericope under consideration is located. This fact is of some significance for the present study, not only because the artificial groupings throughout the Travel Narrative are rather easily detected,[3] but also because, as B. Reicke has shown,[4] the pericopes of the Travel Narrative have in common a striking characteristic: they concern either instruction of the apostles, regarded as leaders of the faithful and missionaries, or discussion with opponents. Instruction and discussion may therefore be regarded as the main themes of the Travel Narrative.[5]

---

[3]Here and in any further references the present writer means by "Travel Narrative" only Lk 9, 51 - 18, 14. Examples of groupings are 9, 52 - 58. 59 - 60. 61 - 62 (the nature of discipleship); 10, 17 - 20. 21 - 22; 23 - 24 (the privileges of the disciples); 11, 1 - 4. 5 - 8. 9 - 13 (prayer); 15, 1 - 6. 7 - 10. 11 - 32 (mercy); 16, 16. 17. 18 (the Law).

[4]Loc.cit., pp. 110ff. Cf. also supporting researches (e.g. E. Lohse, "Missionarisches Handeln Jesu nach dem Evangelium des Lukas," Theol Zeitschr 10 [1954], pp. 1 - 13) cited by Reicke.

[5]Reicke finds the following rough distribution of the motifs of instruction and discussion in the whole Travel Narrative (loc. cit., p. 114): (chapters) 10: first half instruction; second half discussion; 11: first half instruction (incl. 10, 38 - 42); second half discussion; 12: whole chapter instruction; 13: first half instruction, then discussion; second half instruction, then discussion; 14: first half discussion; second half instruction; 15: whole chapter discussion; 16: first half instruction; second half discussion; 17: whole chapter instruction; 18, 1 - 14: first instruction, then discussion.

Moreover, instruction and discussion presuppose instructors:

> These themes [instruction and discussion] may be supposed to have been especially important with regard to the education of ministers and missionaries. Indirectly, one may infer that such instruction did take place, even if the existence of organized schools is out of the question. Acts 2, 42, where the instruction given by the twelve apostles is mentioned, indicates that the apostles acted as teachers of the Jerusalem congregation. Considering the fact that according to Acts 1, 21 - 22 every apostle had to be an eyewitness of the life of Jesus, one may postulate that the actions and the sayings of the Lord were an important subject of this teaching. Acts 13, 1 further shows that in a similar way some recognized persons acted as teachers in Antioch, precisely in the centre of the first Christian world mission. They may aptly be regarded as teachers not only of believers in general, but especially of future ministers and missionaries [italics this writer's], for according to v. 2 it was they who were responsible for sending out Barnabas and Saul on their first journey. Their teaching activity may be an illustration of the Sitz im Leben of the traditions contained in the Travel Narrative. It is only a possibility, but one that must be pondered seriously, that this circle of teachers in Antioch constituted a practical background for the collection of the Travel Narrative traditions, even if these traditions may also be traced back to the apostles in Jerusalem and to the Lord himself.[6]

Reicke admits of course that there are exceptions to this distribution and that the chapter divisions do not always correspond to the material, but on the whole, his position that there is in this section of the third gospel a "rhythmical oscillation" between the motifs of instruction and discussion appears to be fully justified. In particular, however, the question of whether Chapter 17 should be considered wholly instruction remains open to further considerations in this study.

[6]Reicke, loc. cit., p. 111.

Hence a general presumption in favor of "teacher-training" interests should not be excluded from the consideration of Lk 17, 20f; nor can this specific type of teaching activity as practiced at Antioch be summarily dismissed as irrelevant to the background of the pericope.[7]

Literary Forms Immediately Surrounding Lk 17, 20f

Turning to particulars in terms of literary forms surrounding Lk 17, 20f, the evidence suggests that the evangelist (or a predecessor) had before him a number of independent units, both narrative and discourse, which he simply inserted within a larger block of material. In some instances the reasons for insertion must remain largely hypothetical, if indeed any reasons can be assigned other than that it was important to include these pericopes somewhere, and this location was as good as any.

Thus, within a block of parables dealing generally with powerful persons who trusted rather too thoroughly in their positions (16, 19 - 31 a rich man; 18, 1 - 8 a judge; 18, 9 - 14 a Pharisee), the compiler has placed a group of unattached

---

[7] To be sure, these remarks partially anticipate step two of the analysis as outlined above (pp. 80ff); the anticipation may be justified on the grounds that the approach is from the general to the particular.

sayings (17, 1 - 2. 3 - 4. 5 - 6. 7 - 10), the story of the ten lepers (17, 11 - 19),[8] and what has been referred to as the non-Marcan apocalypse (17, 20 - 37).[9] The present writer can ascertain no special reason for the insertion of 17, 1 - 10; the geographical reference in 17, 11 may account for the inclusion of the story of the ten lepers (or vice versa!); the parable of the unjust judge could well explain the position of the apocalyptic discourse.

Lk 17, 20f Is a Pronouncement-Story

Leaving the precise relationship of the apocalyptic discourse (vv. 22 - 37) to vv. 20 - 21 for a later treatment, it is permissible to proceed with the discussion of Lk 17, 20f as an independent pericope, for no critic disputes the position that originally at least, vv. 20 - 21

---

[8] Taylor (op. cit., pp. 75. 153. 155) thinks that this pericope may at one time have been a pronouncement story which eventually changed form through transference of details during the oral period. Bultmann (Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, 3rd ed. [Göttingen], 1957, p. 33) includes it among his biographical apophthegmata, observing correctly that the saying (17, 17ff) is relevant only within the story. Since the miracle is not the point of emphasis, this writer is inclined to accept Bultmann's classification, but Taylor's less prejudicial nomenclature, i.e. a "story about Jesus."

[9] Cf. W. L. Knox, op. cit., pp. 106 - 109. These verses are also considered as a unit by Wikenhauser, op. cit., p. 203; esp. B. Noack, op. cit., pp. 39ff; and editorial division in some texts and versions, e.g. Merk, op. cit., p. 269; NEB: NT, p. 132; e contra: Bible de Jerusalem, p. 1378.

circulated as a self-contained unit. The proof of the assertion is the very structure and content of the pericope itself, i.e., if vv. 20 - 21 are isolated, the reader has before him a complete question and a complete answer; and regardless of the difficulty in interpreting either or both, there is no impression of an unfinished narrative or saying.

In terms of specific literary structure and content, there is a narrative element, i.e., an introduction relating the identity of the questioners and their question (v. 20a). The introduction functions as a barely sufficient establishment of a situation that is a frame for the saying. The discourse element predominates (vv. 20b - 21) and indeed is climactic, working from a negative statement (vv. 20b - 21a) to a culmination in the positive assertion (v. 21b). The order of importance is therefore from v. 21b (most important) to v. 20a (least important). The relative minor importance of v. 20a is easily seen if one contrasts Lk 17, 20f with the story of the ten lepers (17, 11 - 19). In the latter form, the saying (17, 17ff) is almost meaningless without the narrative introduction; in the case of 17, 20f, the saying could stand as a relevant statement even without its sparse narrative introduction.

The literary form combining situation-and-logion, in which the logion is the true raison d' etre of the unit has

been analyzed and discussed in detail elsewhere.[10] For present purposes, V. Taylor's designation "pronouncement-story" is quite apt for describing the form since his term includes both the discourse and narrative elements in the order of importance, and without presuming anything as to the Sitz im Leben.[11] By his own count, Taylor has isolated some thirty or forty pronouncement-stories in the synoptic gospels;[12] eleven occur in Lk.[13]

---

[10] Cf. esp. V. Taylor, op. cit., pp. 63ff; R. Bultmann, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, 3rd ed., (Göttingen, 1957), pp. 8ff; M. Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, 3rd ed., ed. G. Bornkamm (Tübingen, 1959), pp. 34ff.

[11] Léon-Dufour's "la sentence encadrée" is equally good, if not better than Taylor's designation. Unfortunately, Bultmann continues to use the term "Apophthegmata," which he subdivides into "Schulgespräche (e.g. Lk 17, 20f) and "Streitgespräche and "biographische Apophthegmata." His general category ("Apophthegmata") is too literary, too hellenistic, and too prone to neglect totally the narrative element of the form. Worse yet is Dibelius's term "Paradigma," for it presumes the Sitz im Leben Ecclesiae to be sermonic needs, and it tells nothing whatever of the literary structure.

[12] Ibid., pp. 30. 63ff.

[13] The pericopae peculiar to Lk have been designated by the present writer with the customary letter L; this designation does not necessarily imply that this writer subscribes to the proto-Lk hypothesis. The Lucan pronouncement-stories are as follows: 7, 19 - 23 The Baptist's Question (Q: Mt 11, 2 - 6); 9, 57 - 62 The Nature of Discipleship (Q: Mt 19, 22; Mt has two stories instead of Lk's three); 10, 25 - 28 The Great Commandment (Q: Mt 22, 34 - 40; Mk 12, 28 - 31); 11, 14 - 23 The Beelzebub Controversy (Q: Mt 12, 22 - 30; Mk 3, 22 - 27); 11, 27 - 28 The Blessing of Jesus's Mother (L);

There are also close parallels in rabbinic literature.[14] Moreover, Bultmann finds an analogy in the Greek Chreia, a form employed for the apophthegms of Greek philosophers.[15] Though the analogies from rabbinic and hellenic literature are always interesting and sometimes helpful in form-critical analysis, they are, in the present instance, not nearly so significant as might be imagined, for since the aim is to isolate a definite oral form in primitive Christian circles, and since in the case at hand that form is determined easily from the abundant evidence in the synoptic gospels themselves, the analogies from other literatures are unnecessary, once their existence is acknowledged. In other words, here again source criticism lends important assistance to form criticism by showing that the numerous pronouncement-stories derive from different sources (Mk, Q, M, and L), and hence the affirmation that the

---

12, 13 - 15 The Question of Inheritance (L); 13, 1 - 5 The Murder of the Galileans (L); 13, 10 - 17 The Bent Woman (L); 14, 1 - 6 The Dropsical Man (L); 17, 20 - 21 The Coming of the Kingdom (L); 23, 27 - 31 The Weeping Women (L).

[14] Bultmann (op. cit., pp. 39 - 58) cites many apposite parallels; Taylor cites one example (op. cit., p. 29). Cf. also J. Bonsirven, Textes Rabbiniques (Rome, 1955) where clear parallels may be found in number 407 (Gamaliel II) and number 603 (Hillel).

[15] Ibid., p. 24. Dibelius (op. cit., p. 162f) and Kümmel (op. cit., p. 32) agree with Bultmann's analogy. The latter concludes that because Lk 17, 20a is cast in the form of a Chreia, it is a literary construction added to the logion. The proposal receives attention later in this chapter.

forms did actually circulate widely is considerably strengthened. Not only that but also the distribution of the forms according to sources furnishes valuable information on the question of how early the forms were circulating:

> The distribution of the Pronouncement-Stories has some bearing on the question of their early currency and genuineness. There are at least twenty in Mark, seven or nine in Luke's special source, four or five in Q, one in Matthew, and none in John. If the stories are products of Christian imagination, why do they not increase in number as time passes, and as new problems confront the growing Church? Why is there no Pronouncement-Story about the necessity of the Cross, or the Gentile Mission, or the foundation and organization of the Church? The absence of these topics in the stories which have come down to us gives us reason to pause before views which credit the first Christians with a facility for invention and an imagination always at command. If Bultmann is right, Christian imagination was potent where it was least needed, feeble or wanting where silence called for its exercise; it left undone the things which it ought to have done, and did the things it had no need to do.[16]

The self-contained character of the pronouncement-stories, their varied practical content, their early

---

[16] V. Taylor, op. cit., pp. 86, 87. Taylor's variation on the number of L stories seems to rest upon his hesitancy in classifying the story of the ten lepers (17, 11 - 19) and his understandable reluctance to include what is surely a pronouncement-story in Codex D after Lk 6, 4. One pronouncement-story belongs to Jn, viz. The Woman Taken in Adultery (7, 53 - 8, 11); Taylor admits its literary form, but not its canonicity. This writer is inclined to add to the list Lk 16, 14, 15 (The Hypocrisy of the Pharisees).

currency, and their diverse origins all lead to the conclusion that these forms circulated as single units (e.g. Lk 14, 1 - 6) or in groups linked by a purely topical thread (e.g. Lk 9, 52 - 58. 59 - 60. 61 - 62). The primary agents in their distribution would of course have been the "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word" who had the requisite knowledge of the facts; but that information would have been expressed and repeated in community after community (Acts 8, 1. 14. 26; 9, 32) in the context of practical problems and varying circumstances such as those outlined above (pp. 82ff) in the discussion of the Sitz im Leben Ecclesiae.

Stabilized to a large extent by repetition, pronouncement-stories would have become valuable guides for Christian thought and action. At the same time a certain flexibility of application, dictated by local concerns, would have allowed for transferences in purpose and even in the form itself.[17]

A comparison of the structure and orientation of the pronouncement-stories listed in note 13 above, to mention only a cross-section of those available from the synoptic sources, reveals the same leading characteristics described above with reference to Lk 17, 20f. Hence an analysis in terms of the structural elements in their order of importance is justified. In other words, it is clear that Lk 17, 20f is

---

[17]Cf. Chapter IV, note 16 above.

a pronouncement-story; and since in a pronouncement-story everything leads up to the final word of Jesus, which, in the present instance, is a) a positive assertion (v. 21b) b) preceded by a contrasting negative assertion (vv. 20b - 21a) and since the narrative introduction serves as hardly more than a frame[18] for the pronouncement, the investigation into the oral period can be in terms of a search either for a corresponding form with the same pronouncement or a similar one, or, failing that, for any form embodying a corresponding pronouncement. It so happens that there is in the synoptic gospels no exact parallel to Lk 17, 20f. Nor does any passage in the remainder of the NT offer a pronouncement-story parallel. However, with the help of Acts and certain echoes in the NT epistles it is possible to pursue the inquiry.

A Pauline Parallel and Its Implications

Allusion has already been made to the teaching activity of early Christian leaders who moved from one community to

---

[18] Cf. e.g. Lk 11, 27, 28; 12, 13 - 15 where the minor importance of the frame is clearly illustrated by the fact that it consists in a minimal kind of reference identifying the questioner. If a miracle is a part of a pronouncement-story, the latter can be distinguished from a miracle-story in that a pronouncement-story's miracle is related for its bearing on the pronouncement rather than for itself. The distinction is clear if, for example, one contrasts Lk 13, 10 - 17; 14, 1 - 6 with Lk 7, 11 - 17; 8, 29 - 39.

another (Acts 8, 1. 14. 26; 9, 20. 29. 32; 11, 19. 22. 25; 16, 4). Moreover, as B. Reicke has shown,[19] there were centers of instruction, such as Jerusalem and Antioch, where new teachers received and gave instruction (Acts 2, 42; 13, 1; 15, 35; Gal 1, 18; 2, 2). One such teacher was Paul (1 Cor 15, 3; Phil 4, 9; 1 Thes 4, 1; 2 Thes 3, 6; Rom 16, 17), who taught at Antioch (Acts 11, 26; 13, 1; 15, 35) and received instruction there (Acts 13, 2; 14, 26) and at Jerusalem (Acts 15, 19; Gal 1, 18; 2, 2).

Paul's letters reveal a familiarity with the gospel tradition not only by his explicit citations of the sayings of Jesus (1 Cor 11, 23 - 25: Lk 22, 19, 20; 1 Tm 5, 18: Lk 10, 7), but more especially by his allusions to or paraphrases of the sayings of Jesus (1 Thes 4, 8: Lk 10, 16; 1 Thes 5, 2: Lk 12, 39; 2 Thes 1, 5: Lk 20, 35; 2 Thes 1, 11: Lk 18, 1; 1 Cor 7, 10, 11; Lk 16, 18; Rom 12, 14: Lk 6, 28; Eph 6, 14: Lk 12, 35; Eph 6, 18: Lk 21, 36; Col 1, 3: Lk 18, 1; Col 1, 13: Lk 22, 53; Ti 1, 15: Lk 11, 41).[20]

---

[19] Reicke, loc. cit.

[20] This observation has been made by Riesenfeld, but with much less detail and for another purpose (loc. cit., p. 140). He finds the tendency to allude or paraphrase (rather than cite) sayings of Jesus a characteristic in all NT letters (e.g. Jas 1, 25: Jn 13, 17; Jas 2, 5: Mt 5, 3ff). His conclusion is confirmed by the tables of comparison in E. G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter (London, 1946), pp. 376f; 442 - 449.

It will be remarked that the foregoing citations and allusions or paraphrases in Paul have, in every instance, parallels in the third gospel. The striking correspondence does not warrant, however, the deduction that Paul depended upon the third gospel in some very early stage of its composition nor does it warrant an assumption of Lk's dependence upon the Pauline letters.[21] First, the parallels are not always exact: 1 Cor 7, 10, 11, for example, is hardly closer to Lk 16, 18 than it is to Mk 10, 11, 12; as a matter of fact the latter passages are more nearly alike to one another than Paul is to either. Second, in several instances listed above Paul could be reflecting Q: 1 Thes 5, 2, for example, is barely closer to Lk 12, 39 than it is to Mt 12, 43.

On the other hand these correspondences do show that Paul was familiar not only with the synoptic tradition in general but also with the distinctive tradition behind Lk's gospel: 1 Cor 11, 24: Lk 22, 19b (L); 1 Tm 5, 18: Lk 10, 7 (τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ as compared with τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ in Mt 10, 10b); Rom 12, 14: Lk 6, 28 (contrast Mt 5, 44); Eph 6, 14: Lk 12, 35 (contrast Mt 24, 43).

Points of contact between the Lucan and Pauline traditions are hardly surprising, for the author of the third gospel

---

[21] D. M. Stanley ("Pauline Allusions to the Sayings of Jesus," CBQ 23 [1961], 26 - 39) insists on this same point, with reference to Pauline allusions to sayings of Jesus recorded in all the synoptics.

is the author of Acts, and the author of Acts was a companion of Paul, viz. Lk, who was in the most conservative estimate well acquainted with Antioch and took particular interest in it (Acts 11, 19 - 27; 13, 1; 14, 19. 21. 26; 15, 22. 23. 30. 35; 18, 22).[22]

Granted the multiple contacts between Lk and Paul and their mutual familiarity with the same milieux in which the gospel tradition circulated, it is therefore not strange to find in Rom 14, 17 a passage which has every appearance of being an allusion or an expanded paraphrase of the pronouncement now ensconced in Lk 17, 20f.[23]

In the context of an appeal to Christians to avoid giving scandal, the apostle simultaneously re-affirms freedom from the Mosaic Law and service to God through the Holy Spirit:

---

[22]The truth of each of the assertions in this paragraph has been demonstrated in a number of studies. Cf. e.g. the thorough treatment of A. Plummer, The Gospel According to St. Luke (Edinburgh, 1908), pp. xi-xxii.xli-lxvi; M. J. Lagrange, L'Evangile selon S. Luc (Paris, 1921), pp. x-xxvii; F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles (London, 1951), pp. 1 - 13; J. M. Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke (London, 1953), pp. xi-xxiv; J. Schmid, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Regensburg, 1955), pp. 5 - 27; A. Wikenhauser, Die Apostelgeschichte (Regensburg, 1956), pp. 5 - 10.

[23]The parallel is noted in A. Merk, op. cit., p. 269. It receives a brief treatment in W. L. Knox, op. cit., p. 108.

16 μὴ βλασφημείσθω οὖν ὑμῶν τὸ ἀγαθόν.
17 οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βρῶσις καὶ πόσις,
ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ·
18 ὁ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ δουλεύων τῷ χριστῷ εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ
καὶ δόκιμος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις

If the positive part of what appears to be an allusion or a paraphrase is compared with Lk 17, 21b, the resemblance is striking:

Rom 14, 17 b:	Lk 17, 21b
[ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ] δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ [ἐστιν.]	ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν.

And the correspondence is strenghtened rather than weakened by the addition of the negative parts from each passage.[24]

17a οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βρῶσις καὶ πόσις,	20b οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως
	21a οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν· ἰδοὺ ὧδε ἢ ἐκεῖ·
17b ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.	21b ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν.

[24] The possible objection that οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως (17, 20b) cannot really be

Moreover, the suggestion that Paul is actually alluding to or paraphrasing a saying of Jesus appears certain from the fact that in Rom 14, 17 the apostle employs the phrase "kingdom of God" in a manner that is entirely exceptional in his letters. As W. L. Knox has observed:

> The usage is unique in Pauline writings. In Paul the kingdom is either an eschatological force at work on earth (1 Cor 4, 20; Col 1, 13; 4, 11), heaven as a state to be attained by the righteous, presumably after its establishment at the Second Coming (1 Cor 6, 9. 10; 14, 40; Gal 5, 21), or the Messianic kingdom between the Second Coming and the end . . . The term was not popular in the Hellenistic Church (it is used eight times in Acts, twelve times in the Pauline Epistles) . . . It was too deeply embedded in the Gospels and presumably in popular Jewish - Christian homiletic to be eliminated entirely; but it seems unlikely that Paul would have invented a new use of it, and more likely that he slipped into current Christian language with which he was familiar in dealing with a specifically Jewish - Christian problem. The kingdom of God as an eschatological force at work

---

equivalent to οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βρῶσις καὶ πόσις . (Rom. 14, 17a) is not formidable in the light of the researches of E. Lohmeyer (Das Vater-unser 2nd ed. [Göttingen, 1947], pp. 62 ff.) who has shown that the Hebrew concept of coming is not simply "coming about," but implies the divine action of bringing about, of realizing something in the temporal sphere. Hence the correspondence can be maintained: the reign of God is not realized by observance (Lk) is equivalent to: the reign of God is not food and drink (Rom). The present writer is indebted to R. E. Brown's "The Pater Noster as an Eschatological Prayer," TS 22 (1961), 190n.2 for its calling attention to Lohmeyer's conclusions.

> on earth exists in virtue of the fact that it is at work in the souls of those who accept it.[25]

Several other considerations favor the plausibility of a common tradition underlying Lk 17, 20f and Rom 14, 17. It will be recalled that βασιλεία is fittingly rendered "reign"[26] and that Lk treats the Reign of God under different aspects,[27] presumably because his sources viewed the Reign variously. The present interpretation specifies one more aspect: an equivalence of the Reign with the Spirit. In connection with Lk 11, 2, and after having referred to a Lucan variant, according to which "some MSS read (162,700, Greg Nys, Maxim Conf, Marcion) 'May your Holy Spirit come upon us and purify us,'" R. E. Brown continues, "This

---

[25] Knox, op. cit., p. 108n.2.

[26] Cf. Chapter three of the present study, note 29 (p.59 ff.). Cf. in addition to the literature there cited: G. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, tr. I. McLuskey et al. (London, 1960), p.200n.2: "The translation 'reign' is certainly more to the point, for it expresses the fact that the βασιλεία has not been constituted by its citizens (inhabitants of the realm) but by the will and the rule of its king (in this way alone does it correspond with Oriental ideas), and should not be pictured according to the analogy of a particular defined territory. Only for this reason can we speak (in the temporal sense) of the 'nearness' and the 'coming' of the βασιλεία.. But this does not exclude the physical idea. For God's reign is synonymous with God's new world."

[27] Cf. Chapter three of the present study, note 29 (p.61f.).

equivalence between the Spirit and the kingdom is not un-Lucan. In Acts, 1, 6 - 8 when the disciples ask about the coming of the kingdom, Jesus answers them in terms of the coming of the Holy Spirit (cf. also Mt 7, 11 as compared with Lk 11, 13)."[28] Brown's observation prompts the query as to whether the account in Acts 1, 6 - 8 is not in some way parallel to Lk 17, 20f. This much at least is certain: Jesus' reply to the question when (Acts 1, 6) is, ultimately, a promise of the Spirit (Acts 1, 8), and if Lk 17, 21b is a promise of the Spirit as Rom 14, 17 implies, there is indeed a parallel, the basis being Lk's theological outlook rather than parallel literary structure. And since a question about the coming of the Reign of God can be answered in terms of the coming of the Spirit, it is pertinent to recall here that the eschatological nature of the former is retained in the latter. The events of Pentecost (Acts 2, 1ff) are conceived eschatologically (cf. Peter's sermon, Acts 2, 14ff).

---

28 R. E. Brown, art. cit., p.190. Considering what is to be said of Lk's occasional equivalence of the Spirit and the Reign of God, this writer hesistates to accept Brown's conclusion that Lk 11, 2 is an eschatological prayer in the sense of a petition for the definitive reign of God at the end of time. The aorist (ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου) is adduced as an argument in favor of the latter interpretation; but could not the Lucan petition, looking to the daily growth of the Church in the increase of numbers through missionary efforts, refer to the reception of the Spirit in the once-administered sacrament of Baptism?

Hence the pronouncement in Lk 17, 21b does not lose its eschatological character by reason of being parallel by Rom 14, 17. Rather, the Lucan pronouncement can reasonably be viewed as an eschatological promise: all the verbs in Lk 17, 20f have a future significance, except perhaps that of 17, 21b. Historically the verb in 17, 21b would not have been expressed in Aramaic; there is no reason to doubt that the intention as to time was the same as that of the other verbs in the pericope, but in the light of the Pentecost experience the saying would have called for a present tense in Greek, which is still capable of both a present and future meaning, e.g. "The Reign of God is within you," or "The Reign of God is (to be) within you."

In addition, that Lk's coming of the Reign is conceived in the context of rejected Judaic observances is surely hinted at in his version of the mission of the seventy (10, 1 - 16) where the instruction to the disciples is to eat what is set before them (vv. 8 - 11; contrast Mt 10, 7 - 11) as well as in the account of the Beelzebub controversy (11, 14ff) where, presumably, the charge of liason with Beelzebub rests on Jesus' disregard for Mosaic observances.

Indeed, it is not necessary to restrict the internal aspects of the Reign of God preached during the oral period to the Lucan-Pauline echoes of the gospel tradition. The Matthean parables of the hidden treasure and of the pearl (Mt 13, 44 - 46 M) certainly

suggest something to be possessed rather than entered. And it is Mt (12, 28; contrast Lk 11, 20) who speaks explicitly of the operation of God's Spirit vouching for the Reign's presence, a reference that, in the later experience of the Church, might very well have been related to the reception of the Spirit in Baptism. Moreover, it is at least possible that originally Mk. 9, 1 and Lk 9, 27 were separate from their present contexts and alluded to the reception of the Spirit.

At this point it is perhaps well to summarize the results thus far: Within the synoptic tradition there is to be found a view of the coming of the Reign that is equated with the coming of the Holy Spirit. The view is more pronounced in Luke-Acts (e.g. Acts 1, 6 - 8), where the eschatological character of the coming of the Spirit is emphasized (Acts 2, 14ff). The correspondence between Rom 14, 17 and Lk 17, 20bf suggests that during the oral period there circulated a saying or a pronouncement-story whose point was that Jesus had said that the Reign of God is not realized by Mosaic observance, but by the reception of the Holy Spirit.[29] The full significance of his words would of course have been appreciated only in the aftermath of the experience of

---

[29] Whatever the original form of the tradition (a saying or a pronouncement story), the second person plural pronoun in Lk 17, 21b would have been a general reference as in Lk 11, 20 where the addressees are Pharisees, as they are in Lk 17, 21b.

Pentecost, but the events of Pentecost would in themselves have called for the recollection of those words which were not an anti-apocalyptic pronouncement, but an eschatological promise.

Historical Crisis and the Pronouncement

Vital concerns within the primitive church made such a pronouncement appropriate for handing on from the very beginnings in, for example, Jerusalem and Antioch. Catechetical instruction and missionary enterprise raised problems concerning observances to be retained or imposed or dismissed (cf. e.g. Gal), and a defense would have been needed not only against non-Christian Jews, but against Jewish Christians as well (Acts 15, 5).

There is no need to suppose that Stephen, for example, was the first to be accused of changing the customs which Moses delivered (Acts 7, 4) nor the first of the Hellenists to reply in terms of a charge that his opponents were resisting the Holy Spirit (Acts 7, 51). Circumstances such as those in which Philip found himself in Samaria (Acts 8, 4ff) and those in which Peter found himself in Caesarea (10, 1. 14ff) suggest that the dissident Samaritans and Gentiles like Cornelius would have profited from the pronouncement in Lk 17, 20f. The mention of a circumcision party within the Christian community (Acts 11, 2) implies an opposition. Would that opposition have gratefully recalled

the Lord's saying? Would Barnabas have used it for the Greeks at Antioch (Acts 11, 23)? Presumably the crisis described in Gal 2, 11 had been preceded and followed by like occurrences with lesser principals. The dispute at Antioch (Acts 15, 1ff) which was continued at Jerusalem was an apt setting for the recall of the pronouncement in Lk 17, 20f. Peter's speech at the council (Acts 15, 8ff) in which there is an explicit appeal to the priority (in importance) of the Spirit over the Law and an allusion to the burdensomeness of the Law show that more than one Jewish Christian might have welcomed the tradition contained in Lk 17, 20f and Rom 14, 17. Nor is it impossible that Barnabas and Paul might have repeated the tradition in their subsequent teaching activity in Antioch (Acts 15, 35) and especially in their missionary endeavors and catechetical concerns to strengthen the churches (Acts 15, 41). Surely every recorded dispute over Mosaic observance presupposes a whole history of them.

Accordingly, the understanding here defended for the pronouncement in Lk 17, 20f is plausible not only because it is philologically sound (as seen in the discussion of μετὰ παρατηρήσεως and ἐντὸς ὑμῶν) nor only because the gospel tradition does show Jesus' opposition to the exalted position granted Pharisaic observance (e.g. Lk 6, 1 - 5. 6 - 11; 11, 37 - 42) and transmits his teaching on that facet of the inauguration of the Reign which is identified with the coming of the Holy Spirit. There is more:

the crises within the primitive church's struggle to preserve her distinctive character and develop the theological commitment consonant with her mission demanded the recollection and preservation of the type of guide to thought and action that Lk 17, 20f is.[30]

The Function of the Narrative Introduction

Before treating Lk 17, 21a (οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν [who?]· ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ ἢ ὧδε) the wording of which is at least suspect by reason of the nearly exact repetition in 17, 23 where the reference to false prophets makes complete sense (καὶ ἐροῦσιν ὑμῖν· ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ ἢ ἰδοὺ ὧδε), attention may be focused on v. 20a, the frame of Lk's pronouncement-story. The narrative introduction reads:

20a ἐπερωτηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν φαρισαίων,
πότε ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ,
ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν·

---

[30] It is probably unnecessary that the present writer state here that his exegesis has nothing in common with a purely immanentist notion of the kingdom. The divine δύναμις expressed through the operation of the Spirit is only one aspect of Lk's tradition of Jesus' preaching about the kingdom: the kingdom's inauguration is foreshadowed in the person and work of Jesus (Lk 10, 6 - 8; 11, 20), promised (Lk 17, 21; Acts 1, 8) and realized at Pentecost (Acts 2, 1ff). Even these aspects are manifested externally (Lk 10, 6 - 8; 11, 20; Acts 2, 1ff) as would be expected from Hebrew categories through which the divinity operates.

R. Bultmann asserts that though the saying of Jesus (vv. 20bf) is a genuine logion of Palestinian origin, the form of the introduction betrays a hellenistic origin since it corresponds to the Chreia, a form commonly employed for the apophthegms of Greek philosophers. Lk himself, according to Bultmann, probably created the introduction.[31] In reply to Bultmann, W. L. Knox has commented that the style of v.20a only means that Lk on this occasion took the trouble to alter an original ἐπηρώτησαν δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ φαρισαῖοι — καὶ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν into its present form; but Knox wonders that the evangelist should have done so here and not at 18, 18.[32] The latter observations prompt several remarks.

Though Lk or an earlier compiler could have invented the frame for the pronouncement, its style alone is not a conclusive argument that he did so. Indeed, certain considerations warn against such an easy assumption. First, and most important perhaps from the point of view of form-critical analysis, there are no pronouncement-stories precisely parallel to Lk 17, 20f, the result being that it is impossible to institute a comparison through which the role of imagination might be assessed. Second,

---

[31] R. Bultmann, Die Geschichte der synop. Trad., 3rd ed. (Göttingen, 1957), p.24.

[32] Knox, op. cit., 107n.3.

the literary form of Lk 17, 20f is made very much more effective by this barest minimum of an introduction which provides a preparation for the pronouncement by identifying the questioners. The significance of the mere mention of Pharisees is sufficient literarily speaking to warrant the assumption that the pronouncement-story (and not merely a logion) circulated as a pronouncement-story during the oral period. Paul has had to elaborate and expand the tradition (Rom 14, 17) precisely because he did not cite the pronouncement-story form of it. The force of this second point will be seen after the full discussion of Lk 17, 20a. Thirdly, so far as style is concerned, why should not the author of Lk 1, 1 - 4 have had the requisite skill to recast the narrative element, as Knox suggests?

In connection with Knox's remarks it may be observed that Lk was surely not the gospel tradition's only exponent who was capable of phrasing that tradition in literary Greek. Knox asks why Lk did not alter 18, 18. The same question might be asked with reference to the Semitic cast of Lk 8, 8; 9, 39 (in contrast to the literary Greek of Mk [!] 4, 8; 9, 18) or passages that are more Hebraic in Lk than in Mt (compare e.g. Lk 9, 28. 29. 33. 38. 39 with Mt 17, 1. 2. 4. 15; Lk 13, 30; 18, 35; 20, 1 with Mt 19, 30; 20, 29; 21, 23).[33] One plausible

---

[33] Léon-Dufour ("L'Évangile selon S.Luc," Introduction à la Bible, II [Tournai, 1959], pp. 231f) offers a convenient summary of the inconsistencies of Lk's language and style.

explanation is that in many instances at least, Lk simply incorporated his sources as he received them. The brevity and compactness of Lk 17, 20a, limited as it is to providing a singularly apt setting for the saying, suggest that Lk 17, 20f is one of those instances in which Lk has transmitted what he received without literary alteration. In addition, the occurrence in such a short saying of two key words that are hapax in Lk's gospel (παρατήρησις and ἐντός) strengthens the argument for the evangelist's having incorporated the whole form as he found it.[34] In summary, so far as the literary form is concerned, the present writer is of the opinion that the entire unit (i.e. the narrative element [v. 20a] plus the saying [v. 20b. 21]) circulated as a pronouncement-story during the oral period, that the whole is of Palestinian origin (cf. the mention of Pharisees, kingdom of God, observation), and that its currency among Greek speaking Jews and Gentiles who chafed at

---

[34] As indicated earlier, opponents of the rendering "in the midst of you" for ἐντὸς ὑμῶν frequently argue that Lk would have used ἐν μέσῳ had he meant "in the midst of" (cf. Lk 2, 46; 8, 7; 10, 3; 22, 27; 24, 36; Acts 1, 15; 2, 22; 27, 21). This writer favors "within you," but not for the reason just alleged; for it is possible to reverse the argument by asserting that had Lk meant "within," he would have employed ἐν as he frequently does in that sense and with a plural of separated parts (e.g. Lk 3, 8; 7, 49; 21, 4; 24, 32). The meaning of ἐντός must be derived from the context; but the fact that the preposition occurs at all and that there is yet another hapax in the only other verse of the pericope at least raises a presumption in favor of the present assertion, viz. that Lk has preserved the pericope as he found it.

the prospect of Mosaic observances gave the hellenistic style to the introduction at a very early date.

It has been asserted that though the narrative element in the pronouncement-story of Lk 17, 20f is brief, its function is extremely significant for the effectiveness of the form as a whole since it prepares the hearer or reader for a saying that will be in some way related to Mosaic observance. The truth of this assertion is demonstrated by an analysis of the introduction's content. Two points may be noted: 1) the questioners are Pharisees; and 2) they ask for a date (πότε), not for a sign.

What impression would the mention of Pharisees have produced upon those who first heard the pronouncement-story? Judging by the traditions preserved in Luke-Acts, the very word "Pharisee" would have conjured up a vision of unbending religious observance of the Mosaic Law in its most literal interpretation. By the present writer's count, the term "Pharisee" or its plural occurs twenty-three times in the third gospel and seven times in Acts. Negatively, the tradition which Lk preserves nowhere presents the Pharisees asking for an apocalyptic sign regarding the future. Indeed, in the Luke-Acts tradition the Pharisees NEVER ask for a sign of any kind. Positively, the traditions which Lk transmits represent Pharisaism in the context of some feature of the Mosaic Law as its adherents esteemed and interpreted it. The verification for this assertion is found not only in the majority of

of instances where Pharisees are mentioned, but in every instance except one:[35] Lk 5, 17. 21 (blasphemy); 5, 30 (eating with tax collectors); 5, 33 (fasting); 6, 2 (Sabbath observance); 6, 7 (Sabbath); 7, 30 - 37 (association with a sinner); 11, 37 - 38 (ritual washing); 11, 39 - 43 (excoriation of exaggerated observance); 11, 53 (laying a trap to see if Jesus' words are against the Mosaic Law); 12, 1 (excoriation for hypocrisy in the name of the Law); 14, 1. 3 (Sabbath); 15, 2 (eating with sinners); 16, 14 (hypocrisy, greed, externalism); 18, 10 (pride); 19, 39 (blasphemy); Acts 5, 34 (teaching rights); 15, 5 (circumcision etc.); 23, 6 - 9 (the doctrine of the resurrection vs. the Sadducees); 26, 5 ("the strictest party of our religion").

It is not here denied that some Pharisees might have had apocalyptic interests; the point is that Lk does not convey that impression at all. The traditions preserved in the third gospel and Acts leave the strongest sort of impression that "Pharisee" equals "rigid observance" and that equation is, in the opinion of this writer, precisely the function of the explicit mention of the Pharisees in Lk 17, 20a.

As for the question of the Pharisees ("When is the Reign of God to be effected?"), it may be safely asserted that the query is surely an eschatological one, but not necessarily a question

---

[35] That is, 13, 31 - 33 (The Departure from Galilee) in which the Pharisees warn Jesus about Antipas.

colored by apocalyptic. To make the question equivalent to "What are the signs of the kingdom's coming?" is to attribute to the Pharisees an interest in apocalyptic that is not verified in Luke-Acts. More seriously, it is to miss the Leitwort character of the term Pharisees in the narrative element of the pronouncement-story form.[36] Rather, the question appears to be parallel to that of Acts 1, 6 where also the query is in terms of the date, not of signs.[37]

---

[36] Moreover, it can now be seen that renderings such as "The Kingdom of God is not coming visibly," (Goodspeed, op.cit., p.74); or "The Kingdom of God is not coming with signs to be observed" (RSV) are really very misleading: (1) not only because they misinterpret παρατήρησις, which (cf. chapter three of the present study) never means "sign" nor (in biblical Greek) the observation of a sign so as to know the future; (2) nor only because there is no evidence in Luke-Acts that the Pharisees would have asked such a question to receive such an answer; (3) but also and especially because the question is misinterpreted by reason of a disregard for the literary form of the whole pericope, and particularly by the disregard for the function of the narrative element in which the term Pharisees is a literary pointer to what is coming (i.e. the pronouncement).

[37] If the passages in Luke-Acts mentioning "signs" are examined, additional pertinent information emerges. In general, signs (σημεῖα sometimes with τέρατα "wonders") can be considered under three headings: those spoken of by Jesus' doubters or opponents; those spoken of by those in favor of him; and those spoken of by Jesus himself. Only once (11, 16) in the entire tradition recorded in Luke-Acts is Jesus asked by doubters or opponents for an apocalyptic sign and not by Pharisees nor as a key to some future event, but as an authentication of his present message and announced mission (In Lk 23, 8 Herod is reported as hoping to see Jesus work a "sign," but the context clearly favors the meaning of a miracle, not an apocalyptic sign related to the coming of the Reign of God).

When "signs" are spoken of by those in favor of Jesus, they are, in every instance but one, authentications of Jesus' identity and character (Lk 2, 12; 2, 34; Acts 2, 22) or the disciples' mission that continues his work (Acts 2, 43; 4, 16. 30; 5, 12; 6, 8; 8, 6. 13; 14, 3; 15, 12).

(For the sake of completeness, mention must be accorded the reference to signs in the prophecy of Joel, Acts 2, 19; and Acts 7, 36 speaks of Moses' works as "signs.")

The one exception is the request (Lk 21, 7) of an unidentified plurality (Mt. 24, 3 : "the disciples"; Mk 13, 3 "Peter and James and John and Andrew") for a sign of when the destruction of the temple will take place. Even here the sign of what is about to be is distinguished from the date on which the events will take place. Even if the questions exemplify Hebrew parallelism, that does not prohibit two shades of meaning.

Jesus himself speaks of a sign on only two occasions in Luke-Acts. In the first instance (11, 29 - 30), it is a refusal of the sort of sign requested as an authentication for his mission (not a refusal of a sign heralding the arrival of the kingdom) and a promise of the sign of Jona. In the second instance, he does speak of signs in apocalyptic language (21, 11), but his speech is not a refusal of signs. Rather, he answers the question put to him not by the Pharisees, but, presumably, by the disciples.

The inescapable conclusion would seem to be that in the Luke-Acts tradition it is not the Pharisees, but the disciples and Jesus himself who show an interest in apocalyptic signs which portend the future, for the only time a question is asked about a sign regarding the future, it is asked by the disciples and answered by Jesus.

Recapitulation

Once again, for the sake of clarity, it is perhaps well to summarize the results of the investigation and their implications at this stage: Originally, Lk 17, 20f was a pronouncement-story that circulated as an independent unit within the early gospel tradition that was transmitted in Jerusalem, Antioch, and other centers where Jews and non-Jews came together as brothers in Christianity (e.g. Caesarea). The forces that shaped and preserved the pronouncement-story were missionary and catechetical demands which sought for a clarification on the delicate problem of Mosaic observance and for an appreciation of the eschatological character of the gift of the Holy Spirit. The original form appears to have been a tightly constructed piece, sharply limited to the essentials that make for a successful pronouncement-story and hence characterized by the brevity and pointedness which facilitated easy recollection and transmission. In particular, the narrative element of Lk 17, 20f was restricted to serving its usual function as an entry to the literary form's major feature: the pronouncement. In swift succession the mention of the Pharisees (a synonym for rigid Mosaic observance) and their eschatological query set the stage for a rejection of the efficacy of Pharisaic observance and, as a culmination, for the eschatological promise of the new order, graphically realized first in Jesus

himself who became a life-giving spirit through the Resurrection-Ascension (Acts 2, 32 - 33; Rom. 1, 4; 1 Cor 15, 45; Phil 2, 9; 1 Tm 3, 16), then through the eschatological events of Pentecost (Acts 2, 1ff. 33) and, subjectively, in every Christian's Baptism.[38]

What Is To Be Said of Lk 17, 21a?

There remains the obligation of considering more closely Lk 17, 21a, and several explanations of the verse present themselves.

One plausible explanation is that the verse as it is now worded belonged to the primitive pronouncement-story as it actually circulated during the oral period. If this is the case, the meaning appears to be in the form of a progression from v.-20b: the Reign of God will not be effected by rigid observance, nor will they say, "lo here" or "there!" i.e. as if the Reign of God were restricted to a locale (Palestine? Jerusalem? the temple?);

---

[38] In Lk 17, 20f then, there is a link between the synoptic tradition concerning the Reign of God and the theology of the redemptive character of the Resurrection, which is do fully explored by Paul. The link, obscure as it is, is not so hypothetical as might be imagined at first sight, for the meeting point is in Rom 14, 17 where the peculiar use of the term "Reign of God" points back to the synoptic tradition, while the mention of the Spirit as a possession of the Christian looks both to the emerging theology in the first chapters of Acts and to the highly developed theology of, for example, Colossians and Ephesians.

rather, it will be universal. The difficulty with this hypothesis lies not in the interpretation of v. 21a, but in the wording of the verse. What would "they" have meant to Pharisees? In 17, 23 where the verse is repeated, "they" clearly refers to false prophets, and it is understandable that Jesus would have warned the disciples, to whom the words are addressed (17, 22).

Hence the critic is tempted to assert an interpolation, i.e. an insertion by a pre-Lucan compiler or by Lk himself who wished to join closely 20 - 21 and 22 - 37. The difficulty is that in reality the only basis for claiming an insertion in 17, 20f is the fact of almost identical wording in 17, 23. It cannot be claimed that 17, 21a is totally without significance as it stands. Moreover, would a compiler risk tampering with a fixed form to the extent of interpolating an entire verse? Possibly. Lacking weightier evidence, however, such an assumption appears to be a bit arbitrary.

There is yet a third explanation, rather more speculative, to be sure, but nonetheless possible, viz. that another verse very similar to 17, 23 belonged to the pericope originally and that the compiler who wished to join vv. 20 - 21 to vv. 22 - 37 altered the phraseology ever so slightly in order to bind the two pericopae.

It will be recalled that the most ancient interpretations

of Lk 17, 21b tend to associate it with Dt 30, 12 - 14 and Rom 10, 6 - 8. The tendency is verified even in instances where the ultimate interpretations of v. 21b differ.[39] Did these interpreters merely accommodate texts to bolster their various interpretations? Or was there a tradition that made v. 21a an allusion to Dt 30, 12 - 14?

In its proper context Dt 30, 11 - 14 portrays the Law revealed to Israel as something accessible: it is in the mouths and hearts of the Israelites, not up in the sky nor across the sea:

> For this command which I enjoin on you today is not too mysterious and remote for you. It is not up in the sky, that you should say, 'Who will go up in the sky to get it for us and tell us of it, that we may carry it out?' Nor is it across the sea, that you should say, 'Who will cross the sea to get it for us and tell us of it, that we may carry it out?' No, it is something very near to you, already in your mouths and in your hearts; you have only to carry it out.[40]

In Rom 10, 5 - 8 Paul accommodates the Deuteronomic text to the accessibility of justifying faith, which is sharply

---

[39] Cf. chapter two of the present study: Oxy. P. 654: 2, 9 - 16 and the Coptic Gospel According to Thomas (pp. 7 - 10); Tertullian (p.15); Origen (p.12f); Cyprian (p.15); Athanasius (p.13).

[40] The Holy Bible (Confraternity of Christian Doctrine) I (Genesis to Ruth), tr Members of the Catholic Biblical Association of America (Paterson, 1952), p.496. Cited hereafter as CCD.

contrasted with the inefficacy of Mosaic observances:

> Moses writes that the man who practices the righteousness which is based on the law shall live by it. But the righteousness based on faith (ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη) says, 'Do not say in your heart, "Who will ascend into heaven?" (that is, to bring Christ down) or "Who will descend into the abyss?"' (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead). But what does it say? 'The word (τὸ ῥῆμα) is near you, on your lips and in your heart' (that is, the word of faith (τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως) which we preach) . . .[41]

Both the Greek version and the Coptic version of the Gnostic Gospel According to Thomas attach a development of Dt. 30, 12 - 14 to Lk 17, 21b, thus attributing the composite (as well as what follows) to Jesus.[42] The following is a comparison of Oxy.P. 654: 2, 9 - 16 and Lk 17, 21:[43]

---

41 The New Testament (Revised Standard Version: New York, 1946), p.340. Cited hereafter as RSV.

42 The Greek text appears in chapter two of the present study (p.8); Fitzmyer's translation of the Coptic version will be found in chapter two of this study, p.11 n.12. The Coptic differs slightly: "in the sea" instead of "under the earth" and "but" (alla) instead of "and" in line 16.

43 The translation is that of Fitzmyer (op.cit., p.520). The translation of Lk is that of the present writer.

Jesus says

If those who draw you on say to you, 'Behold the kingdom in the heaven,' the birds of the heaven will be before you. But if they say that it is under the earth, the fishes of the sea will enter before you. And the kingdom of God is within you and outside . . .	nor will they say lo here or there! for lo, the Reign of God is within you.

Tertullian draws an explicit parallel between Dt 30, 12 - 14 and Lk 17, 21:

> Quod si in praecepto est Dei regnum, propone igitur contra, secundum nostras antitheses, Moysen, et una sententia est. 'Praeceptum,' inquit, 'excelsum non est etc.---in corde tuo et in manibus tuis facere illud. Hoc erit 'Non hic nec illic, ecce enim intra vos est regnum Dei.'[44]

And indeed if the pertinent phrases in Dt 30, 12 - 14 are compared with Lk 17, 21, the possibility of an allusion in the latter appears:

---

[44] Tertullian, Adv. Marcion 4, 35 (CSEL 47: 542).

It is not up in the sky that you should say, 'Who will go up in the sky to get it for us . . .	nor will they say lo here
Nor is it across the sea that you should say, 'Who will cross the sea . . .	or there!
No, it is something very near to you, already in your mouths, and in your hearts . . .	for lo, the Reign of God is within you.

The above comparisons are not instituted as an argument for some sort of mathematical equivalence between words or phrases in Lk 17, 21 and those in Dt 30, 12 - 14. Rather, the comparisons illustrate how it was possible for the ancient interpreters to link the Deuteronomic and Lucan texts, and the comparisons suggest that the same connection might have been made by the auditors of the Lucan pericope during the oral period. Further, Paul's use of Dt 30, 12 - 14 shows that Jesus himself could have used the Deuteronomic text with reference to the rejected Mosaic observances in order to prepare his auditors for what otherwise must have been a rather mysterious pronouncement in v. 21b. The notion of the Law in the heart (e.g. Jer 31, 31ff) would have been familiar enough; indeed, that notion would have been sufficient until the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost prompted the recall of the incident behind Lk 17, 20a and the saying (17, 20b - 21) whose full significance was by that time no longer so obscure.

Hence it seems not unreasonable to conjecture at least that v. 21a was, even in the oral period, a part of the pronouncement-story in the form of a catch-phrase or clause of some kind which alluded to Dt 30, 12 - 14. To attempt a reconstruction of the original phraseology, if anything other than what now appears in Lk ever existed, would be futile. But if the present conjecture has any validity at all, the conclusion has to be that the wording of 17, 21a was either the same as it is now or at least not appreciably dissimilar.

Lk 17, 20 - 21 and 17, 22 - 37

Finally, what is to be said of the relationship between vv. 20 - 21 and vv. 22 - 37? That they are joined is clear from the parallel verses 21a and 23 and from the lack of a narrative element in v. 22. On the other hand, that each pericope retains its identity can be seen from the fact that vv. 20 - 21 form an eschatological pronouncement-story, while vv. 22 - 37 constitute an apocalyptic discourse. The latter has different addressees[45] and a different content.[46]

---

[45] Bultmann (op. cit., p.24) and Dibelius (op. cit., p.162) rightly view v.22 as the beginning of an originally independent pericope. Kümmel (op. cit., p.32) implies the same thing when, with reference to vv. 20 - 21, he speaks of the "lack of connection with what goes before and after."

[46] This assertion is made in the light of what has been said

about the anti-observance and eschatological content of vv. 20 - 21. B. Noack (op. cit., pp. 38ff) is alone in asserting that there is a strict thematic unity in vv. 20 - 24. According to Noack, the latter verses treat generally of the return of the Son of Man, with only a change in addressees. His assertion, viz. that vv. 20 - 24 present a contrast between the happy present and the perilous future is open to serious objections. In the first place, if vv. 20 - 21 refer to the happy present, why are the addressees Pharisees and not the disciples? As a matter of fact the note of joy is not really found in vv. 20 - 21. Secondly, while it is true that a change of addressees does not necessarily mean a change of theme (cf. 12; 14, 7 - 24; 16), it is equally true that a change of addressees can indicate a change of theme (cf. 11, 5. 25). Thirdly, Noack's assumption that the Son of Man and the Reign of God are so closely related that the absence of one means the absence of the other is quite gratuitous. As shown earlier, the character of the Reign of God is multiple and must be gathered from the context in every instance; but there is no context that makes the Son of Man's coming exclusively coextensive with the Reign's arrival. The various aspects of the Reign of God complement one another. If it is assumed that the Reign of God is co-terminous with the physical presence of the Son of Man, what is to be said of the traditions that speak of the growth of the Reign of God? And is the Reign of God restricted to the Parousia? No such limits are suggested by Lk (7, 28; 12, 18. 20. 28. 29; 18, 16. 17. 24. 25. 30; Acts 14, 22). Moreover, the "days of the Son of Man" is a phrase designating the "days of the Messia," the corresponding term in rabbinic terminology (Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar II, in loc.), which, as the context of vv. 22 - 37 demonstrates, refers to the glorious and terrible days; this is certainly not a parallel to Lk 17, 21b, as Noack asserts. None would deny that "the days will come" (v.22) indicates a contrast, but the assertion that the contrast is with the content of the previous pericope rests entirely on the supposition that vv. 20 - 21 and vv. 22 - 37 are thematically joined.

Finally, it must be said that interpreters who see in vv. 20 - 21 an intentional and explicit apocalyptic content, i.e. a rejection of apocalyptic reckoning, will have to explain how it is that the very thing supposedly rejected is exactly what forms the heart of the discourse in vv. 22 - 37.

What, then, did the compiler intend by his connection of the two pericopae? W. L. Knox has suggested that vv. 20 - 21 were attached to the apocalyptic discourse by "a compiler who wanted a suitable narrative with a question and answer to introduce his apocalypse, and considered that any question and answer that had anything to do with the kingdom of God was good enough to serve his purpose."[47] Knox's proposal strikes the present writer as perhaps too casual, neglecting as it does, two features of the gospel tradition which the third evangelist transmits: (1) a tendency to suppress apocalyptic elements, especially if they are linked to the Parousia;[48] and (2) a theology that regards the coming of the Holy Spirit as an eschatological event.[49]

---

[47] Knox, op. cit., p.107.

[48] Lk's use of "signs" has already recieved attention (p.121 n.37). In addition, the following items are pertinent: In Lk 21, 7 the disciples ask, "What will be the sign when this is about to take place?"; Mt 24, 3 (par.) reads: "What will be the sign of your coming and of the end of the age?"; Cf. also Mt 24, 13 (Mk 13, 13): ". . . he who endures to the end will be saved."; while Lk 21, 19 has "By your endurance you will gain your lives."

Mt. 24, 14 ". . . and then the end will come" is omitted in Lk. Compare and contrast Mt 24, 15 - 22; Mk 13, 14 - 20 with Lk 21, 20 - 24: in the latter the specific mention of Jerusalem, this people, Gentiles, shows that the evangelist is tending away from end-time expectations.

Mt. 26, 64; Mk 14, 62: " . . . hereafter you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of Power and coming on the clouds of heaven . . ."; while Lk 22, 66 reads, "from now on the Son of Man shall be seated at the right hand of the Power of God."

All the above comparisons demonstrate the tendency of the third evangelist to de-emphasize apocalyptic future eschatology, though of course the Parousia itself (as a fact) is not at all denied (cf. chapter three, note 30, pp. 59ff).

49

The equivalence of the Spirit and the Reign of God has been treated above (pp.109ff). The matter can be further elaborated: A striking feature of the eschaton is the gift of the Spirit, who was promised (Lk 3, 16; 12, 12; 24, 49; Acts 1, 5. 8; 2. 33) and sent (Acts 2, 4) for all generations everywhere (Acts 2, 39 incorporates Is 57, 19 and Joel 2, 32), provided that they meet the necessary conditions (Acts 2, 38). Where the good news of the Reign of God is announced and accepted, the Spirit is given (8, 12. 14 - 17).

There is an unmistakable characterization of the Spirit as a kind of interior Law directing, guiding, and prompting within the church (Acts 5, 32; 8, 39; 10, 19; 11, 12; 11, 28; 13, 2. 4; 15, 28; 16, 6); in particular, the influence of the Spirit is notable in difficult situations (Acts 4, 8; 4, 31; 7, 10; 7, 55). The gift of the Spirit is a guarantee of God's favor (Acts 10, 44 - 47).

It has been emphasized over and again (e.g. chapter three, n. 30) that Lk certainly does not neglect to transmit the tradition concerning the Parousia, the decisive intervention also called the Reign of God (19, 11; 21, 31), but that tradition does not exclude the Spirit as eschaton; rather, it presupposes it. It may be that Paul's profound exploration and development of the theology of the Holy Spirit as the first installment of the Reign (cf. e.g. 2 Cor 1, 22; Eph 1, 14) has overshadowed Lk's treatment of the same concept. Whatever the case, H. Conzelmann's estimate (op.cit., p.95) that "the Spirit Himself is no longer the eschatological gift, but the substitute [italics, this writer's] in the meantime for the possession of ultimate salvation" simply cannot be sustained in the face of Lk's own witness to what Pentecost meant to him and to his contemporaries.

In the opinion of this writer, it is these two features that account for vv. 20 - 21 having been joined to vv. 22 - 37. It has been proposed already that Lk 18, 1 - 8 prompted the position of the apocalyptic discourse. But the latter discourse could not avoid raising the Parousia expectations that were so unsettling within the primitive Christian communities (cf. e.g. 1 + 2 Thes). What better place, then, was there to attach a positive pronouncement on the presence of the Reign of God? Harmful apocalyptic speculation might thereby be offset. Hence the most general theme resulting from the combination of 17, 20 - 21. 22 - 37; 18, 1 - 8 is something akin to this: The Reign of God is already within you (vv. 20 - 21), yet you must take care to live according to it, for the Son of Man will return suddenly (22 - 37) to punish those who do evil (18, 1 - 8). It is the position of the present writer that vv. 20 - 21 originally had nothing in common with future apocalyptic eschatological hopes. The juxtaposition with vv. 22 - 37, however, eventually prompted interpretations that were based more on vv. 22 - 37 than on vv. 20 - 21. Form-critical analysis restores to vv. 20 - 21 its proper identity and frees its interpretation from undue influence suggested by the content of vv. 22 - 37. In this connection, it is worth noting that the apocalyptic interpretation of vv. 20 - 21 does not appear until the rise of eschatologism, i.e. until after 1890!

Admittedly, the inquiry into the origin and meaning of Lk 17, 20f has, in the course of this study, become rather involved. The complicated investigation, detailed in this chapter and the previous ones, springs from the pericope itself, which, by reason of its very conciseness, raises problems in the interpretation of almost every phrase. Yet, in the opinion of the present writer, the evidence justifies approximate answers to the basic questions asked about any passage similar to Lk 17, 20. Both the evidence and the conclusions are of course subject to continual review.

The Sitze: Conclusions

Based on the arguments presented earlier, a final summary of the conclusions is possible:

The Sitz im Leben Jesu, that is, the concrete historical circumstances in the life of Jesus that assure the existence of Lk 17, 20f are at least implied. There is no reason to deny that behind the pericope lies an historical incident, one of the numerous encounters between Jesus and the Pharisees, who certainly heard him speak of the Reign of God. Upon being asked when the Reign of God was to be effected, Jesus would have eschewed any reference to a date (as in Acts 1, 7) and presumably did turn the question to essentials by reminding his auditors that their emphasis upon externals would not effect the Reign

of God. Perhaps he alluded to Dt 30, 12 - 14, employing the text to bring out the interior aspect of the Law. Possibly he might have cited Jer 31, 31ff before asserting that the Reign of God was to be something interior.

The above reconstruction is of course tentative, for the exact details of what is surely an historical event simply have not been regarded by the evangelist as of primary interest.

Rather, the interest of the primitive Christian community in Lk 17, 20f seems to have been much more practical. The Sitze im Leben Ecclesiae that account for the shaping and preservation of Lk 17, 20f have been detailed above. Briefly, it may be said that missionary and catechetical concerns found in the tradition a welcome exposition of the relationship between Mosaic observance and the gift of the Spirit, which was so much in the forefront of primitive Christian theology.

The Sitz im Evangelium has also received detailed attention. In summary, it appears reasonable to propose that Lk 17, 20 - 21 is meant to serve as an anti-apocalyptic pericope, but not in the sense that it is directly concerned with apocalyptic. Rather, its position makes it anti-apocalyptic in so far as it neutralizes the apocalyptic stimuli in vv. 22 - 37 by re-affirming the presence of the Reign of God.

On all three levels the most significant part of Lk 17, 20f is the eschatological promise in v. 21b and that is why the

pronouncement-story was the most apt form for putting into relief that promise first heard obscurely from the lips of Jesus, then preached and taught in the aftermath of its fulfillment, and, lastly, set down in the written tradition as a reminder that the Christian need not fear the Parousia, for the Reign of God is already within him.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Biblical Texts and Versions

Burkitt, F. C. Evangelion Da-Mepharresche. 2 vols. Cambridge 1904.

Delitzsch, F. Novum Testamentum Hebraice. Berlin 1912.

Field, F. (ed.). Hexapla Origenis. 2 vols. Oxford 1875.

The Holy Bible. Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. 3 vols. Published to date. Paterson 1952.

The Holy Gospel of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Ethiopic. Asmara 1912.

Horner, G. (trans.). The Coptic Version of the New Testament: Sahidic and Thebaic. Vol. II. Oxford 1911.

_____. The Coptic Version of the New Testament: Memphitic and Bohairic. Vol. II. Oxford 1898.

Kittel, R. (ed.). Biblica Hebraica. 8th ed. Stuttgart 1952.

La Sainte Bible traduite en Français sous la Direction de l'École Biblique de Jérusalem. Paris 1956.

Luther, M. Die Bibel. Dresden 1895.

Merk, A. Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine. 8th ed. Rome 1959.

Merx, A. (ed.). Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas nach der syrischen im Sinaikloster gefunden Palimpsesthandschrift. Berlin 1905.

Nestle, E. Novum Testamentum Graece. 23rd ed. Stuttgart 1959.

_____. The New English Bible: New Testament. Oxford 1961.

The New Testament. Revised Standard Version. New York 1946.

Platt, T. P. (ed.). Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi. Ethiopic. Leipzig 1899.

Rahlfs, A. (ed.). Septuaginta. 2 vols. 5th ed. Stuttgart 1952.

Salkinson, S. and Ginsburg, K. Hebrew New Testament. Jerusalem 1894.

Smith, J.M.P. and Goodspeed, E.J. The Complete Bible. An American Translation. Chicago 1951.

Tischendorf, C. Novum Testamentum Graece. 2 vols. Leipzig 1872.

Von Soden, H. Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments. 2 vols. Göttingen 1913.

Wordsworth, J. and While, H. Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi Latine. Oxford 1898.

II. Patristic Texts

Citations from the Fathers are taken from the following critical editions:

Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte. Leipzig 1897- (Academy of Berlin)

Migne, J.P. Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series graeca. Paris 1857-1866.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Leipzig 1866- (Academy of Vienna)

Corpus Christianorum. Series latina. Turnholt 1953- .

Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium. Louvain-Washington 1903- .

III. Studies on Luke 17, 20f

Allen, P. "The Meaning of ἐντός," ExpT 49 (1937) 476-477.

Allen, P. "Luke 17, 21," ExpT 50 (1938) 233-235.

Easton, B.S. "Luke 17, 20-21: an exegetical study," The American Journal of Theology 16 (1912) 275-283.

Griffiths, J.G. "ἐντός," ExpT 63 (1951) 30-31.

Noack, B. Das Gottesreich bei Lukas. (Symbolae Biblicae Upsaliensis 10.) Uppsala 1948.

Roberts, C.H. "The Kingdom of Heaven (Lk XVII. 21)," HarvTR 41 (1948) 1-8.

Rüstow, A. "ΕΝΤΟΣ ΥΜΩΝ ΕΣΤΙΝ zur Deutung von Lukas 17, 20-21," ZNW 51 (1960) 192-224.

Sledd, A. "The Interpretation of Lk 17, 21," ExpT 50 (1938) 235-237.

Strobel, A. "Die Passa-Erwartung als urchristliches Problem in Lc 17, 20f," ZNW 49 (1958) 157-195.

_____. "A. Merx über Lc 17, 20f," ZNW 51 (1960) 133-134.

IV. Concordances, Encyclopedias, Lexica

Arndt, W.F. and Gingrich, F.W. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago 1957.

Bauer, J.B. (ed.). Bibeltheologisches Wörterbuch. Graz 1959.

Haag, H. (ed.). Bibel-Lexicon. Einsiedeln 1956.

Hatch, E. and Redpath, A. A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. 3 vols. Oxford 1897.

Kittel, G. and Friedrich, G. (edd.). Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testaments. 6 vols. Stuttgart 1933.

Koehlen, L. and Baumgartner, W. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden 1953.

Liddell, H.G., Scott, R., Jones, H.S. and McKenzie, R. A Greek-English Lexicon. 9th ed. Oxford 1940.

Mayser, E. Die Grammatik der griechischen Papyri. Leipzig 1923.

Moulton, A. and Geden, H. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. Edinburgh 1926.

Payne Smith, R. Thesaurus Syriacus. 2 vols. Oxford 1879.

Pirot, L. and Robert, A. Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément. 36 fasc. to date. Paris 1926ff.

Schmoller, A. Handkonkordanz zum Griechischen Neuen Testament. 11th ed. Stuttgart n.d.

Zorell, F. Novi Testamenti Lexicon Graecum. 2nd ed. Paris 1931.

V. Other Works

Benoit, P. "Reflexions sur la 'Formgeschichtliche Methode,'" RB 53 (1946) 481-512.

Blass, F. and Debrunner, A. Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch. 9th ed. Göttingen 1954.

Bornkamm, G. Jesus of Nazareth. tr. I. McLuskey. London 1960.

Bonsirven, J. Les Enseignments de Jésus Christ. Paris 1946.

_____. Le Règne de Dieu. Paris 1957.

_____. Textes Rabbiniques. Rome 1955.

Brown, R.E. "The Pater Noster as an Eschatological Prayer," TS 22 (1961) 175-208.

Bruce, F.F. The Acts of the Apostles. London 1951.

Bultmann, R. Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition. Göttingen 1957.

_____. Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. tr. K. Grobel. London 1956.

Cadbury, H.J. The Making of Luke-Acts. London reprint 1958.

Clavier, H. L'Accès au Royaume de Dieu. Paris 1944.

Conzelmann, H. Die Mitte der Zeit. 3rd ed. Tübingen 1960.

Creed, J.M. The Gospel According to St. Luke. London 1953.

Cullmann, O. "I'avvento presente o futuro del Regno di Dio nel messaggio di Gesù," Protestantesimo 15 (1960) 66-76.

_____. "Out of Season Remarks on the 'Historical Jesus' of the Bultmann School," tr. J. Martyn, Union Seminary Quarterly Review 16 (1961).

_____. Christ and Time. Tr. F. Filson. Philadelphia 1950.

Dalman, G. Die Worte Jesu. Leipzig 1930.

Davies, W.D. and Daube, D. (edd.). The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology. Cambridge 1956.

De Wette, W.M.L. Lehrbuch der Christlichen Dogmatik. 2 vols. Berlin 1818.

Dibelius, M. Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums. (ed. G. Bornkamm). 3rd ed. Tübingen 1959.

Dodd, C.H. The Parables of the Kingdom. 2nd ed. London 1961.

_____. "The Gospels as History," BJRylL 22 (1938) 135ff

Erasmus. Paraphrases. Basel 1522.

Feuillet, A. "La Venue du Règne de Dieu et du Fils de l'Homme," RSR 35 (1948) 544-565.

_____. "Le Règne de Dieu et la Personne de Jésus d'après les Évangiles synoptiques," Introduction à la Bible. Vol. II. Tournai 1959 pp. 771 ff.

Fitzmyer, J.A. "The Oxyrhynchus Logoi of Jesus and the Coptic Gospel According to Thomas," TS 20 (1959) 505-560.

Frick, R. Die Geschichte des Reich-Gottes Gedankens in der alten Kirche bis zu Origenis und Augustin. Giessen 1928.

Fuller, R.H. The Mission and Achievements of Jesus. Chicago 1954.

_____. Luke's Witness to Jesus Christ. London 1959.

Garitte, G. "Les 'Logoi' d'Oxyrhynque et l'Apocryphe copte dit 'Évangile de Thomas,'" Le Muséon 73 (1960) 151-172.

_____. "Les 'Logoi' d'Oxyrhynque sont traduit du copte," Le Muséon 73 (1960) 335-349.

Godet, F. A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke. Tr. E.W. Shalders and M.D. Cusin. New York 1887.

Guillaumont, A. "Les Logia d'Oxyrhynchos sont-ils traduit du copte?" Le Muséon 73 (1960) 325-333.

Harnack, A. Das Wesen des Christentums. Vol. III. Leipzig 1900.

Héring, J. Le Royaume de Dieu et sa Venue. Neuchâtel 1959.

Hermann, J. "Reich Gottes," Calwer Bibel-Lexicon fasc. 4. Stuttgart 1961 cols 1094-1097.

Hunter, A.M. "Interpreting the Parables: the Centrality of the Kingdom," Interpr 14 (1960) 70-84.

_____. "The Gospel in Parables: the Coming of the Kingdom," Interpr 14 (1960) 167-185.

Klostermann, E. Das Lukasevangelium. Tübingen 1929.

Knox, W.L. The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels. 2 vols. Cambridge 1957.

Kuhn, K. "Some Observations on the Coptic Gospel According to Thomas," Le Muséon 73 (1960) 317-323

Kümmel, W.G. Promise and Fulfillment. Tr. D. Barton. Naperville 1957.

_____. Das Neue Testament. Freiburg 1958.

Lagrange, M.J. L'Évangile selon S. Luc. Paris 1921.

à Lapide, C. Commentaria in Lucam. Paris 1877.

Leaney, A.R.C. A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke. London 1958.

Léon-Dufour, X. L'Évangile et les Evangiles. Paris 1954.

Leon-Dufour, X. "Les Évangiles Synoptiques," in Introduction à la Bible. Vol. II. Tournai 1959 pp 145ff.

_____. "Formgeschichte et Redaktionsgeschichte des Évangiles Synoptiques," RSR 45 (1958) 237-269.

Lohmeyer, E. Das Vater-unser. 2nd ed. Göttingen 1947.

Loisy, A. L'Évangile selon Luc. Paris 1924.

McCool, F. "The Preacher and the Historical Witness of the Gospels," TS 21 (1960) 517-543.

McDowell, E.A. "Jesus' Concept of the Kingdom of God," Review and Expositor 57 (1960) 140-155.

McGinley, L.J. Form Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives. Woodstock 1944.

McKenzie, J.L. The Two-Edged Sword. Milwaukee 1956.

Major, H., Manson, T. and Wright, C. The Mission and Message of Jesus. London 1940.

Maldonatus. Commentaria in Lucam. Mussiponti 1596.

Manson, T.W. The Sayings of Jesus. London 1954.

Meinertz, M. Theologie des Neuen Testamentes. 2 vols. Bonn 1950.

Mussner, F. "Der historische Jesus und der Christus des Glaubens," BZ 1 (1957) 224-252.

O'Keefe, V. "Towards Understanding the Gospels," CBQ 21 (1959) 171-189.

Osty, E. L'Évangile selon S. Luc. Paris 1953.

Otto, R. The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. Tr. F. Filson and B. Lee-Woolf. London 1951.

Pedersen, J. Israel: Its Life and Culture. 4 vols. Tr. F. Fausbøll. Copenhagen 1940.

Pius XII. "Divino Afflante Spiritu," AAS 35 (1943) 298-326.

Plummer, A. The Gospel According to St. Luke. Edinburgh 1908.

Ramsey, A.M. "The Gospel and the Gospels," The Gospels Reconsidered. Oxford 1960.

Reicke, B. "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narratives," The Gospels Reconsidered. Oxford 1960.

Rengstorff, K. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. Göttingen 1952.

Riesenfeld, H. "ΕΜΒΟΛΕΥΙΝ-ΕΝΤΟΣ," Nuntius Sodalicii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis 2 (1949) 11-15.

_____. The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings. London 1957.

Rigaux, B. "L'Historicite de Jésus devant l'Exégèse récent," RB 65 (1958) 481-522.

Robert, A. and Feuillet, A. (edd.). Introduction à la Bible. 2 vols. Tournai 1957, 1959.

Schlatter, A. Das Evangelium des Lukas. Stuttgart 1931.

Schmid, J. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. 3rd ed. Regensburg 1955.

Schnackenburg, R. Gottes Herrschaft und Reich. Freiburg 1959.

Schoeps, H. Paul the Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History. Tr. H. Knight. Philadelphia 1961.

Selwyn, E.G. The First Epistle of St. Peter. London 1946.

Sharman, H.B. Son of Man and Kingdom of God. London 1944.

Siegman, E.F. "Teaching in Parables," CBQ 23 (1961) 161-181.

Stanley, D.M. "Balaam's Ass, or a Problem in New Testament Hermeneutics," CBQ (1958).

_____. "Pauline Allusions to the Sayings of Jesus," CBQ 23 (1961) 26-39.

Stauffer, E. New Testament Theology. Tr. J. Marsh. London 1955.

Strack, H.T. and Billerbeck, P. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash. 5 vols. 2nd ed. Munich 1956.

Streeter, B.H. The Four Gospels. London 1936.

Strobel, A. "In dieser Nacht," ZTKir 58 (1961) 16-29.

Taylor, V. The Formation of the Gospel Tradition. London 1960.

Van Imschoot, P. "Reich Gottes," Bibel Lexikon. (ed. H. Haag) Einsiedeln 1956 cols 1412-1418.

Wikenhauser, A. Die Apostelgeschichte. Regensburg 1956.

_____. New Testament Introduction. Tr. J. Cunningham. New York 1958.

Wikgren, A. "ΕΝΤΟΣ," Nuntius Sodalicii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis 4 (1950) 27-31.